FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 224

20 November 1981

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Weinberger Admits 'Position of Strength' Policy AA 1
Further Comment on Reagan Missile Initiative AA 1
'Grossly Unacceptable' [Soltan] AA 1
'Propaganda Exercise' AA 2
Soviet Diplomat Cited [London PA] AA 3
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Article AA 3
Soviet Official Addresses UN on Disarmament AA 4
USSR-U.S. Arms Control Body Ends Geneva Meeting AA 5
IZVESTIYA Condemns U.S. Nuclear War Policy AA 5
[Soldatov, 14 Nov]
Journal Critical of U.S. Approach to Arms Talks AA 7
[Aleksandrov in ZA RUBEZHOM No 46]
British Participate in Nevada Nuclear Test AA 10
[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Import of Brezhnev Interview, FRG Visit Stressed [Shishlin] CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Ponomarev Comments on U.S. Defense Budget A 1
U.S. Views of Soviet Economic Woes 'Dangerous' A 1
[Sandro Viola in Rome LA REPUBBLICA 17 Nov]
APN's Katin Views U.S. Arms, Mideast Policies A 2
[Beirut MONDAY MORNING 16-22 Nov]
U.S., NATO Anti-Soviet 'Spirit' Criticized A 6
[Katerinich in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Reviews 'Schweitzer Episode' A 8
[Mikhaylov, 13 Nov]

CHINA

Beijing Seeking To Disrupt USSR-U.S. Arms Talks B 1
[PRAVDA 20 Nov]
RENMIN RIBAO Commentary B 1
[Barakhta in PRAVDA 12 Nov]

SOUTH ASIA

Radio Comments on UN Discussion of Afghanistan [Korotkov] D 1
Work Progressing on Uzbek-Afghan Bridge D 1
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 5 Nov]

EASTERN EUROPE

'Provocations' in Poland Prompt Sejm Warning F 1
Patience With Solidarity Exhausted in Poland F 1
[Sakhnin in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 11 Nov]
Hungarian Press Recalls Events of 1956 F 10
[NOVOYE VREMYA No 46]

WESTERN EUROPE

DPA Supplies Agenda for Brezhnev FRG Visit G 1
NOVOYE VREMYA Regrets Ledda PCI Meeting Statement G 1
TASS Urges Finns to Follow Kekkonen Line G 2
Brezhnev Congratulates Austrian President G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S. Policy Pro-Israel; Bright Star 'Risky Game' H 1
[Koryavin in IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]
Syrian Newsman Cited on Egypt After As-Sadat H 3
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov]
Khamene'i Sees U.S. Threat to Middle East, Africa H 6
Soviet-Libyan Commission Ends Work in Tripoli H 6

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. Steps Up Anti-Cuban 'Provocations' K 1
[Lapskiy in IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]
TRUD Interviews Cuba's Veiga on U.S. Hostility [13 Nov] K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

IZVESTIYA Publishes More Anniversary Messages O 1
Iranian President [12 Nov] O 1
Saddam Husayn [11 Nov] O 1
President of Sudan [15 Nov] O 1

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Adopts Plan, Session Ends R 1
Session Proceedings R 1
Economic, Social Issues Viewed R 1
5-Year Plan Adopted R 1
Supreme Soviet Ends Session R 2
Comparison of Brezhnev Central Committee Speech R 2
[PRAVDA 17 Nov]
PRAVDA Editorial on Cadre Reserve Problems [13 Nov] R 2
PRAVDA Views Future of Classless Society R 3
[Munchayev, 14 Nov]
NOVYY MIR Publishes Brezhnev 'Reminiscences' [21 Oct] R 6
Zimyanin Attends Soiree Commemorating Writer R 6
[PRAVDA 12 Nov]
Obituary of Marxism-Leninism Prof A.I. Sobolev R 7
[PRAVDA 11 Nov]

Romanov Presents USSR Awards to Leningraders R 7
[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Nov]
Prizewinners Congratulated R 7
[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Nov]
Azerbaijan Raykom Leader Fired for Abuses R 7
[Tairov in PRAVDA 13 Nov]
Kirgiz Prosecutor Accused of Delaying Inquiry R 8
[SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 5 Nov]
Briefs: Tashkent Film Festival R 8

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Soviet Economist Discusses Wage Mechanisms S 1
[Kunelskiy in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 3 Nov]
Ministries With Underutilized Reserves Named [Polenov] S 3
Briefs: Armenian Economy Plan; Armenian Subway Construction; Armenian Health Resort; Turkmen Gas Productions; Turkmen Oil Extraction Complex S 4

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

USSR-Indian 'Bhaskara-2' Satellite Launched U 1
Academician Advocates Science, Production Ties U 1
[Paton in PRAVDA 12 Nov]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Soviet Rocket Troops, Artillery Day Celebrated V 1
Moscow Meeting Held V 1
Tolubko Television Speech V 1
General Gorchakov Address V 4
Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kiev Military Council V 5
[Lyapkalo in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]
Strategic Rocket Forces Deputy Commander Dies V 5
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]
Major General Vishenskiy's Obituary Published V 6
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov]
Supreme Soviet Presidium Announces Promotions V 6

WEINBERGER ADMITS 'POSITION OF STRENGTH' POLICY

LD200034 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, speaking the day after President Reagan's statement, confirmed that the United States was seeking to conduct talks with the Soviet Union from positions of strength. Mr Weinberger said in an interview for NBC television that such was the position of the President himself. Reagan's proposals do not mean, said the defense secretary, that the United States would slacken its rearmament effort.

FURTHER COMMENT ON REAGAN MISSILE INITIATIVE

'Grossly Unacceptable'

LD191736 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Less than 2 weeks remain before Soviet-American talks on nuclear arms in Europe begin in Geneva. Here is what Radio Moscow news analyst Yuriy Soltan writes:

Very many people no doubt will be following the talks closely. Their success would reduce the threat of a nuclear war and make easier the solution of other disarmament problems. Moscow regards the coming talks in Geneva in the most serious way. As Leonid Brezhnev said: Soviet Union is ready to conduct the talks seriously, honestly and constructively, adhering strictly to the principle of equality and equal security of the sides. The Soviet Union seeks no preference treatment for itself, no unilateral advantage or military superiority. It insists only that the security of the NATO countries and of the Warsaw Treaty countries be measured in the same way.

The Soviet Union wasn't the first to begin deploying medium-range nuclear missiles; this was done in response to the actions of the United States and NATO. Since the fifties the United States has deployed in Europe and nearby seas nuclear weapons for striking at the vital centers of the Soviet Union and its allies, and those weapons were called forward-based missiles. The Soviet Union was compelled to develop corresponding arms for its defense and not for threatening anybody, and least of all Europe. It developed those weapons and deployed them on its territory.

Today the United States, France and Britain have 986 medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles, the Soviet Union has 975. As Leonid Brezhnev confirmed in an interview for the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL the Soviet Union is ready to come to an agreement on very substantial reductions of those missiles by both sides. Such a stance takes into consideration the interests of security of everyone.

And what is the United States bringing to Geneva? Well, President Ronald Reagan says that Washington is ready to cancel deployment of new American missiles in West Europe if the Soviet Union dismantles its medium-range missiles. But what about American forward-based missiles? What about the British and French ballistic nuclear missiles targeted at the East? There is an intention to place them outside the talks altogether, and that would be tantamount to demanding one-sided concessions from the Soviet Union. They would like to disarm the Soviet Union altogether by violating through backdoor maneuvering the existing balance of forces in favor of the United States and NATO.

The position of the Soviet Union on all those questions is well known, and no doubt the American leaders also know it, so why the advance proposals that are grossly unacceptable to the Soviet Union? Perhaps this is done in order to create difficulties in the talks in Geneva already beforehand and to make them drag out, or lead them into a blind alley altogether.

As for the Soviet Union, it sees the task of the coming talks in translating into the language of concrete commitments by the sides of the principle of equality and equal security. The Soviet Union would like the talks to result in lowering the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe and in opening the way to further steps in relaxation of military tension.

'Propaganda Exercise'

LD191630 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Even before the President made his statement the White House was at pains to advertise it to the public at home and abroad as a comprehensive and far-reaching program of arms control. If this were really so the U.S. initiative would have every chance to win a positive response. However, right from the start many political observers in Western Europe and also in the United States pointed out that the American proposals are primarily a propaganda exercise, and their real purpose is not to facilitate but rather to obstruct and even deadlock the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. An observer for the ABC television network has pointed out that the United States proposal is essentially unrealistic because it only calls for dismantling the new Soviet medium-range missiles and does not include the United States strategic aircraft based in Europe which can deliver nuclear weapons to Soviet territory nor do they take into account the nuclear potential of Britain and France. The London DAILY TELEGRAPH has told its readers that it is an open secret in Washington that men in the Reagan administration do not even expect that their proposals will be accepted by Moscow since this would mean dismantling all Soviet SS-20 missiles. Another British paper, the FINANCIAL TIMES, points out that President Reagan's proposals had been originally designed by their authors as clearly unacceptable to the other side, and their chief objective is to try and convince the West Europeans that it is not Washington but Moscow which stands in the way of nuclear disarmament in Eruope.

White House officials themselves make no secret of the fact that one of the main objectives of the President's statement has been to weaken the widespread opposition in Western Europe to the adventuristic American doctrines of waging what has been described as a limited nuclear war on European soil. Having mentioned this, let us take now a closer look at the President's latest proposals.

He said that at the Geneva talks which open on 30 November the U.S. delegation would declare that the United States will not deploy its Pershing II and land-based cruise missiles if the Russians undertake to dismantle their SS-20, SS-4 and SS-5 missiles. President Reagan claimed that the United States and NATO have no deterrent to balance off these Soviet missiles. He also denied that there is now a parity between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty in medium-range missiles in Europe. In actual fact, however, the NATO countries have a total of 986 medium-range missiles in Europe now, and the Soviet Union 975 such weapons. This means that there exists a rough parity between the two sides in this field. However, the main strike force of the NATO forces in Europe are more than 700 U.S. aircraft that can carry nuclear weapons and drop them on targets located on Soviet territory. In addition to this there are 64 ballistic missiles and (?55) bombers of the British forces, and 98 missiles and 46 bombers possessed by France. On the Soviet side, most of the medium-range missiles are based on land. They have had to be deployed to balance off the American forward-based weapons and the nuclear capability of the West European NATO countries.

It is not accidential that President Reagan in his statement passed in silence the American forward-based weapons and said nothing about the British and French nuclear-tipped ICBM's and strategic bombers which are all spearheaded eastwards. The present U.S. administration has hinted on many occasions that it does not intend to include into the Geneva talks the problem of U.S. forward-based weapons and the nuclear weapons of other NATO countries; so the essence of the latest proposal by President Reagan is to disarm the Soviet side in Europe and ensure a massive superiority in medium-range nuclear missiles for the United States and its NATO allies.

And one should also note at this point that NATO already has a 50 percent edge over the Warsaw Treaty countries in the number of nuclear warheads per target in a single strike. In its attempt to limit the Geneva talks to the problem of Soviet medium-range missiles alone, which must be dismantled in exchange for the U.S. promise not to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles, the Pentagon is clearly trying to secure military advantage over the Soviet Union. This approach, however, has nothing in common with the principle of equality and equal security which must become the basic principle of the process of arms limitation, as was decided by the participants of the Soviet-American summit meeting.

In his recent interview for the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, President Leonid Brezhnev has pointed out that in all probability those quarters who introduce such proposals really have no desire to conduct talks, especially successful talks. They want such talks to be a failure because this would give them the excuse to carry on the arms race as planned, to implement their plans of turning Western Europe into a launching site for new U.S. missiles targeted at the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders stress that these circles in America try to engineer in advance a means of deadlocking the future talks in order to be able to say: Look, the Soviet Union ignores the views of the West and the United States has no option except to deploy its missiles.

Soviet Diplomat Cited

LD191818 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1656 GMT 19 Nov 81

[By Tom McMullan, PA diplomatic correspondent]

[Excerpt] [No dateline received] The Soviet ambassador to London said today that President Reagan's speech on widespread arms cuts in Europe contained no new proposals. Mr Victor Popov added: "It is a repetition of things already said."

He said the Soviet view of President Reagan's speech to some extent coincided with the British press's analysis.

"The speech was assessed as a propaganda exercise following the unpopularity of American policy making towards Europe," he told the Diplomatic and Commonwealth Writers' Association lunch in London.

Mr Popov indicated some Soviet support for European peace movements' demand that Europe should be a nuclear-free zone. He said the Soviet Union also believed in establishing nuclear-free zones in Europe.

"We are in favour of such a zone in northern Europe. We support the idea of such a zone in the Balkans and the Mediterranean.

"We are prepared to consider adequate measures concerning our own territory for such a zone. That means we approach this question very seriously."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Article

LD200722 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov (TASS) -- "The speech by the head of the White House disclosed the real aims of U.S. policy, which is directed at achieving American military superiority." This is how SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA comments on the U.S. President's speech.

"The olive branch," which the United States is now waving is mere window-dressing, the paper points out in a commentary called "Propagandist Game." "The very problem of medium-range strategic weapons arose through the fault of the United States."

"It is precisely the United States which surrounded the USSR on all sides with military bases. It was solely because of this circumstance that our country was forced to create the appropriate defense potential."

"One of the main tasks of Reagan's speech," in the paper's view, "was undoubtedly to try to stem the tide of Western Europe's antinuclear movement, which is increasing daily. The 'peace-making wrappings' in which the American proposals are offered should, according to Washington's design, blunt the vigilance of the fighters for disarmament."

The United States, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes, is raising obviously unacceptable proposals and thereby creating difficulties on the path of solving one of the most important problems of disarmament. A smokescreen is being launched under cover of which it is intended, in the final analysis, to implement the NATO program."

The paper indicates that Reagan's "propaganda game" has "nothing in common with a genuine striving for disarmament and runs counter to the aspirations of all peace-loving peoples."

SOVIET OFFICIAL ADDRESSES UN ON DISARMAMENT

LD200955 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] New York, 20 Nov TASS -- Soviet representative at the Disarmament Committee Viktor Israelyan analysed in his speech at the UN General Assembly session on Thursday the results of the debate on the disarmament problem at the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. He said among other things that since the emergence of the nuclear weapons in 1945, the Soviet Union has tabled tens of proposals directed at preventing the nuclear war. And we will actively and persistently carry on this line, he said, until nuclear war is outlawed.

As the Soviet representative pointed out, the very fact of adoption by the General Assembly of the declaration proposed by the Soviet Union, the awareness of the fact that the use of the nuclear weapons will be condemned by the world community as the gravest crime against humanity may appear as a moral and political deterrent. Thus, the threat of a nuclear conflict breaking out will be removed and the international political climate on earth will improve. This would be the first step on the way towards a full ban on the use of the nuclear weapons, which would be in the long run complemented with the real nuclear disarmament measures until complete liquidation of the nuclear weapons stocks.

We are ready to reaffirm again that the Soviet Union will never use nuclear weapons against the countries which have renounced their production and acquisition and do not have them on their territory, Viktor Israelyan stressed. As far as the states, which allow the use of their territory for the deployment of nuclear weapons by other countries, are concerned, they themselves undermine their security, as they do not guarantee that a nuclear strike by the aggressor will not be launched from their territory, and consequently they cannot hope for guarantees against a retaliatory nuclear strike, he said.

The Soviet representative has rejected the attempts by delegates of a number of the NATO member-countries to camouflage their negative attitude to the Soviet proposal by claims that it is almost in conflict with the UN Charter, as it deprives the states of the opportunity to use the nuclear weapons as a means of self-defense. Following this logic, it would be necessary to renounce both the treaty on the non-liberation of nuclear weapons and in general all disarmament measures, said Viktor Israelyan.

USSR-U.S. ARMS CONTROL BODY ENDS GENEVA MEETING

LD191554 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Geneva, 19 Nov TASS -- A session closed here today of the Soviet-American standing consultative commission established to promote the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missile systems and the interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, both concluded between the USSR and the USA on May 26, 1972, as well as of the agreement on measures to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, concluded between the two countries on September 30, 1971.

IZVESTIYA CONDEMNS U.S. NUCLEAR WAR POLICY

PM201109 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch from correspondent V. Soldatov: "Rhetoric and Reality"]

[Text] New York -- When, as frequently happens, the U.S. administration blunders, official Washington tries to give the impression that nothing out of the ordinary has happened. This is what was done here after President R. Reagan's statement, which prompted a stormy response from the world public, on the possibility of a "nuclear exchange" during which, as he put it, none of the big powers would press the button for global nuclear war. This pronouncement is now being explained away in terms of the "inexperience" of the President, who is said to have stepped into the "minefield" of the nuclear war debate at a time when concern over U.S. foreign policy is mounting in both the United States and West Europe.

It can, however, scarcely have been simply a misunderstanding or a slip of the tongue. Even in his subsequent clarification the President did not rule out the likelihood of the United States fighting a "limited" nuclear war. This possibility is disguised in a reference to "the flexible response strategy" which the United States is said to follow. The President's clarification fails to give a straight answer to the call by L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, for a "clear and unequivocal statement rejecting the very idea of a nuclear attack as criminal."

One cannot help asking: Why did the U.S. President ignore this call? Does he regard a nuclear attack as a crime against humanity or not? What is the United States trying to achieve by building up its nuclear potential?

The Republican administration is waging an extensive, one could say rabid anti-Soviet campaign in an effort to persuade Americans, West Europeans and Japanese of the existence of a military threat from the Soviet Union, which, it is claimed, obliges the United States and its allies to increase their military spendings. Almost every utterance of the U.S. President, the secretary of state and the secretary of defense contains accusations against the Soviet Union, which is supposedly preparing to attack the West. R. Reagan's recent speech to state and local newspaper editors also contained such an accusation.

U.S. politicians frequently make unfounded accusations on any issue. They are especially uninhibited where the Soviet Union is concerned. It is claimed here that it is hard to give a straight answer to the Soviet leader's proposal. This is explained as being due to the fact that vagueness and ambiguity are the essence of the U.S. nuclear doctrine. The ambiguity, U.S. politicians say, is necessary in order to leave the United States free to act and to mislead the enemy. If this doctrine is of its very nature contradictory, even dangerous, then that is allegedly a necessary evil which just has to be accepted.

There are not that many contradictions in the U.S. nuclear doctrine. The doctrine really is dangerous, however. This danger has recently increased, since U.S. foreign policy has become more aggressive. The administration makes no secret of its preference for nuclear weapons and is trying to get the public used to the idea that it is inevitable that they will be used.

Not so long ago, E. Rostow, who was appointed director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by President Reagan, said that "it would be a mistake to think that a single use of a nuclear weapon would immediately prompt the detonation of the entire arsenal" of both sides. In an interview with the Los Angeles TIMES he claimed that the damage resulting from a nuclear war would be not much more than that resulting from World War I or II.

These and other statements reveal U.S. politicians' train of thought. As Washington administration spokesmen have said on a number of occasions, the United States does not rule out the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war. Moreover, all the signs are that it is actively preparing for one.

The U.S. commentator Jack Anderson recently confirmed that when the Carter administration was planning a military operation against Iran, Washington also considered a proposal code-named "limited strategic option." It envisaged authorizing the Rapid Deployment Force command to drop 19 nuclear bombs on Iran from B-52 bombers.

A frequently heard view is that no attention should be paid to such things since generals are always drawing up plans for fighting a war with whatever weapons they have at their disposal. Government policy is reckoned to be the main factor to be considered. The whole point, however, is that military preparations occupy a key position in the new administration's policy.

This policy is to deploy new nuclear missile systems -- like MX intercontinental missiles, cruise missiles, new missile-carrying submarines, a new supersonic strategic bomber and space weapons. Having decided to implement this program, which will cost the taxpayer $180 billion, the administration refuses to hold talks with the Soviet Union on limiting strategic offensive arms. The current stance of the White House is: first military superiority, then talks.

In order to gain strategic superiority over the Soviet Union, the administration is forcing U.S. nuclear missiles on West Europe. As McGeorge Bundy, special assistant for national security affairs under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, said recently: "The 572 new nuclear-tipped U.S. missiles will perform the same role as systems we already have or plan to have. The only difference is that these missiles can reach Russia from West German territory in just 5 minutes, thus presenting a new opportunity for mounting a super-surprise first attack."

The plans to create in the United States a new strategic communications sytem, on which $18 billion is to be spent over the next 5 years, are further evidence of the White House's true intentions. The new system will enable the President to maintain contact under any conditions with the crews of the B-1 bombers which are designed to "pierce" Soviet antiaircraft defenses.

"All this is in fact," L.I. Brezhnev pointed out in his replies to questions from the editorial board of the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, "the reverse of detente and an outright dismissal of the desire of all peoples for lasting peace." It comes as no surprise, therefore, that protests prompted by the aggressiveness of U.S. foreign policy and the U.S. course of overt confrontation with the Soviet Union are spreading in the United States. Washington's nuclear policy is also causing serious concern and mass protests in West Europe. In recent months commentators, scientists and ordinary Americans have been increasingly saying that the Reagan administration must "cool its ardor" and resume the Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic arms limitation and reduction. Public opinion polls show that the majority of the population thinks the same way.

The Soviet Union's repeated warnings that to try and beat one another in an arms race and to bank on winning a nuclear war is dangerous folly has made a great impression on Americans. This stance reflects the ideas of the majority of the world's peoples, including the American people, the well-known commentator T. Whicker writes.

The New York TIMES recently published a reader's letter in which the writer asked: "If the United States is really interested in preventing the threat of a nuclear conflict arising, why will it not accept the Soviet proposal that the United Nations declare the first use of nuclear weapons a heinous crime against humanity?" A good question.

JOURNAL CRITICAL OF U.S. APPROACH TO ARMS TALKS

PM201049 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 46 Signed to Press 12 Nov 81 pp 4-7

[G. Aleksandrov article: "Instead of an Honest Approach"]

[Text] Soviet-American talks on medium-range nuclear weapons are due to begin in Geneva on 30 November. The approach of the talks has given rise to a sharp intensification of propaganda activity on the part of leading U.S. figures. But of all the speeches, let us take just two delivered by Eugene Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency at the New York Council for International Relations and in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. His views are of some interest -- they make it possible to assess the Reagan administration's approach to one of the key problems of today.

Let us note that in one of his two speeches Rostow gives a summarization which cannot be disputed. "The only rational and humane way out" of the present crisis situation that has arisen in the international arena "would be Soviet-American cooperation with the aim of establishing peace. The rational sphere in which to begin such cooperation is the sphere of arms control, arms reduction and disarmament."

However, after voicing an obvious truth, Rostow immediately rushed in the opposite direction. "We know only too well that the public has a naive, exaggerated faith in the effectiveness of arms control agreements," he stated at the Council for International Relations, stressing that in his view peace is not only the result of agreements, but also of "policing operations."

This military policing approach obviously determines Rostow's entire attitude toward the arms control process as an integral part of U.S. foreign policy which he regards as a means (despite the verbal camouflaging of true intentions) of foisting on the Soviet Union terms for an aggreement which are one-sidedly favorable to Washington.

Here Rostow proceeds on the basis of Goebbels' principle that the more you lie, the more monstrous the lie and the more often you repeat it, the sooner people will believe it. So he turns generally known facts upside down: "The aim of the creation of Soviet nuclear weapons is... intimidation and coercion and -- if necessary -- the capability to start and win a nuclear war."

Let us note that Rostow made this slanderous statement about the USSR even after L.I. Brezhnev, in his answer to a PRAVDA correspondent's question, had exposed a similarly false assertion by U.S. President Reagan. Repeating it with obtuse pertinacity could indicate either the unscrupulousness of the propaganda methods used by the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, or the weakeness of the position he has to defend.

Let us recall one plank in the Republican Party's election platform approved personally by Reagan: "Our main aim and principle is to ensure U.S. military and technological superiority over the Soviet Union." Without mentioning all the militarist measures to implement this goal, let us cite the program submitted by the White House in early October for a sharp buildup in strategic arms which provides for the deployment of 100 MX ICBM's, an increase in the number of Trident submarines and so forth.

As for the USSR, the desire for military superiority is alien to our country. This was stressed in particular in the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress.

Attention should be drawn to the fact that if Rostow really believed that the Soviet Union is prepared to be the first to make a nuclear strike, he would have come out in favor of the adoption of the declaration on preventing nuclear catastrophe which proposes to anathematize whomsoever uses nuclear weapons first for military purposes. After all, the First Committee of the UN General Assembly is the very body that is now discussing the Soviet draft. Rostow's silence, like the evasiveness of Defense Secretary Weinberger (and he wriggled like an eel to avoid giving an honest, direct answer to a concrete question posed by a BBC correspondent), clearly indicates that the U.S. ruling circles do not intend to renounce the use of nuclear weapons. Under cover of "plausible" pretexts, they are prepared to commit that monstrous crime against all mankind.

"The United States makes no preliminary conditions for starting talks," Rostow states. But in explaining the American concept, he makes so many substantial stipulations that it becomes clear that this sentence was nothing more than fine words.

An analysis of the U.S. stance as set forth by Rostow leads to the conclusion that the U.S. Government, having consented to sit down at the conference table under pressure from the American and world public, would like to use the talks for purposes which have nothing in common with arms limitation, still less with arms reduction -- where American arms are concerned, of course. The U.S. administration is not thinking of any kind of parity.

To begin with, by way of propaganda "artillery preparation," Rostow tries to use the existence of the SS-20 missiles to prove that the USSR has superiority many times over in medium-range delivery vehicles. Here he misrepresents the entire history of this issue and does not mention the fact that the USSR has long been insisting on discussing the question of military confrontation in Europe while the United States has remained stubbornly reluctant to do so, that in the process of replacing old missiles with SS-20's not only has the number of delivery vehicles been reduced, but the total capacity of the Soviet medium-range nuclear potential has also been reduced; and that the Soviet missiles deployed within national territory are only a response to the fact that the United States and NATO have targeted an increasingly large number of their own bombs and missiles on Soviet cities.

In his interview for the magazine DER SPIEGEL, L.I. Brezhnev gave the exact number of medium-range delivery vehicles which NATO and the USSR now have in Europe. The number is 986 units and 975 units respectively. And Rostow was forced, reluctantly, to admit that now the "correlation of forces has become almost equal."

So what follows from this in practical terms?

The Soviet Union believes that there is no sphere of disarmament and no category of weapon on which agreement could not be reached. And the problem of medium-range nuclear facilities in Europe could be resolved in the interests of all European peoples.

"The Soviet Union does not seek preferential treatment," L.I. Brezhnev stresses. "We only insist that the United States and the NATO alliance as a whole should measure our security and that of our allies by the same yardstick they use for their own."

"We regard it the task of the forthcoming talks to translate the principle of equality and identical security into the language of concrete commitments by the sides. The Soviet Union would like the talks to result in a reduction in the level of confrontation instead of an increase in that level, and would like the path to be opened up for further steps in military detente in Europe."

But E. Rostow hides behind a very florid formula: "It is necessary to secure terms in agreements on theater nuclear forces and SALT and in our defense plans which will strengthen confidence in the ability of second strike forces to survive and will therefore lessen the need to adopt a first or preemptive strike policy." When this is decoded by the author himself, it turns out to conceal a demand for the "attainment of reductions in Soviet heavy ICBM's, Soviet SS-20 mobile missiles and also other Euromissiles, which constitute an additional threat (?) to targets in Europe, Japan, China and the Near East." It is hard to say what Rostow means by "Euromissiles" which are targeted on virtually half the world simultaneously, but the essence of his "wish" is clear: to make the USSR agree to disarm unilaterally.

It is well known that a special consultative group under the leadership of L. Eagleburger, U.S. assistant secretary of state, is now working within NATO to elaborate joint principles for the talks. According to these plans, attention at the talks should be mainly "concentrated on ground-based missiles" so that the question of aircraft (and the United States alone has more than 700 nuclear-weapon-carring aircraft!) should be "discussed later," while British and French systems are not taken into account at all (although Britain's potential totals 64 ballistic missiles and 55 bombers and France has 98 missiles and 46 bombers). But this approach means flagrantly rejecting the idea of equality and identical security, the more so as it is proposed to leave an integral part of the forward-based nuclear facilities out of account.

As the West German newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER noted the other day, "The United States seeks the resolution of the problem on the basis of the 'zero option,' which is to be confined at first to missile systems alone." In NATO's interpretation this term does not mean an equal reduction in delivery vehicles on both sides, but the dismantling of all Soviet medium-range missiles "in exchange" for the U.S. missiles planned for deployment in Europe.

That is the U.S. approach. It is hard to say what logic lies behind the position of those who are demanding such an unusual "zero solution" leaving aside the American forward-based facilities and refusing to take into account the weapons of the U.S. NATO allies in defining the balance of forces. In any case, it has nothing to do with either objectivity or realism. As admitted even in a report of the North Atlantic assembly's special commission on nuclear weapons, the "orientation toward recognizing the 'zero 'option' as a desirable but unrealistic aim is dictated by the desire to shift the responsibility for the modernization of forces (that is, the deployment of the American Pershing II and cruise missiles) to the Soviet Union."

Most likely the authors of such "proposals" "need to wreck the talks as a kind of excuse for continuing the well-planned arms race and the planned transformation of Western Europe into a launch pad for new American missiles targeted on the USSR," L.I. Brezhnev notes.

This is admitted, in essence, by Pentagon chief Weinberger, who, answering a BBC correspondent's question as to what will happen if the talks are dragged out until 1983 -- the time appointed for the deployment of the American missiles, replied: "I do not foresee these weapons not being deployed. We will embark on deploying them because it is necessary."

In this connection Washington would like to use the very fact of the talks to take the heat out of the antiwar demonstrations.

The report mentioned above gives a very eloquent resume of the U.S. representatives' stance. "During meetings with the special commission, American officials were pessimistic about the chances of success at the talks... the opinion was current that the talks... will not go far unless it is known how things stand with SALT, and, as American official circles have announced, the U.S. stance on the question of SALT will be elaborated and set forth no earlier than 1982. Meanwhile they enumerated a number of components of their approach to the talks: a buildup of military potential to be able to exert pressure at the talks, stricter political linkage and a more effective mechanism for verifying the observance of agreements reached."

This can hardly be described as an honest, constructive approach or a reasonable stance. Yet only these can guarantee the success the peoples are interested in. "We have already said that with a reasonable U.S. stance, if the NATO plans for new missile armaments disappear, we will be prepared to reduce the total number of Soviet missiles," L.I. Brezhnev has stressed. "I will add that we will be prepared to reach agreement on very substantial reductions on both sides."

The Soviet Union says a clear "yes" to any honest talks leading to the curbing of the arms race and real disarmament, and for its part it will work for the attainment of success at the talks. It is now up to the United States to approach them with the same yardstick.

BRITISH PARTICIPATE IN NEVADA NUCLEAR TEST

PM201009 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Nuclear Device Tested"]

[Text] San Francisco -- The latest in a series of underground nuclear explosions was carried out at a test site in the state of Nevada on 12 November.

On this occasion British representatives took part in testing a nuclear device. The explosion was carried out under the agreement between the two countries "on cooperation in the use of nuclear energy for mutual defense purposes."

IMPORT OF BREZHNEV INTERVIEW, FRG VISIT STRESSED

LD191342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0545 GMT 19 Nov 81

[International affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin program entitled: "A Course of Peace and Detente"]

[Excerpts] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's interview for DER SPIEGEL has been a notable event in international life not only because it precedes the visit by the leader of the CPSU and Soviet state to the FRG. This interview also represents quite a full, clear and precise summary of the Soviet stance on certain key issues of international politics. It is all the more valuable because our position is summarized as regards our unsettled world. But this is not all. The interview contains weighty and solid confirmation of the Soviet Union's consistent dedication to the philosophy of peace which determines the whole of our country's foreign policy course.

I would like to say that at the moment European political circles are engaged in what I would call arithmetic -- they are counting up, and stubbornly persisting in counting, the numbers of vehicles the Soviet Union has for nuclear weapons and the number of vehicles owned by the United States and other NATO countries. This is probably a necessary exercise, but I would just like to observe that the counting is done in the bourgeois European countries on the basis of American figures.

There are other figures, and Leonid Ilich presented them in his interview for DER SPIEGEL magazine. These are accurate figures. Incidentally, the London Institute of Strategic Studies, whose conclusions are as a rule trusted in the European capitals, also asserts that there is no intolerable Soviet superiority in medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, and that there is approximate equality here -- which, of course, might be disturbed if NATO plans to site new U.S. nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European states are implemented. We consider that every European country has its own independent voice in world affairs, and Europe is too significant a consideration [velichina] to be the passive object of other people's politics and others' will.

In this regard, of course, the ideas being expressed in various parts of Europe about turning these regions into so-called peace zones or non-nuclear zones seem productive.

Speaking about Europe and the interview granted to the West German magazine by the leader of our party and state, I would like to draw attention to what is said in the interview about Soviet-U.S. relations, and in connection with this, I would like to pick out the thought which, in essence, permeates Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's answers to questions by the West German magazine -- namely the thought that the Soviet Union is by no means engaged in trying to build a kind of moat [rov] between the United States and West Germany, between the United States and France, and so on. It would seem here that the Americans themselves have cause for concern, as they are evoking alarm in the minds of their own partners, their own allies, with their hard policy -- and what is more, their adventurist policy. As far as what directly concerns the Soviet attitude to our ties, our contacts with the United States, the interview quite clearly states the relations Moscow would like to see. We would like these relations to be built on the basis of mutual respect and consideration of each other's rights and interests, and good, friendly relations and cooperation between the United States and USSR, in the name of strengthening peace in the world. This would, of course be for the good both of the American and Soviet peoples, and would be good for Europe and the whole world.

Soviet-U.S. disagreements are at present of a profound nature. With the changeover to the Reagan administration, what was bad during the previous administration has, unfortunately, increased, both quantitatively and, perhaps, qualitatively, in certain things. In any event, we have not heard any single constructive proposal from the United States for many months. And the United States' actions have, of course, been counter to the interests of relaxation of tension, to the interests of establishing trust between states, and to the interests of consolidating peace. These actions are, I repeat, the arms race, the United States' approach to so-called crisis situations and to hot spots which exist in the world, and much more.

True, in recent months the United States seems to have been making some amendments to its stance. In any event, President Reagan expressed the United States' readiness to discuss the problems which divide our countries, and, as it happens, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev welcomed this kind of readiness in his interview, and stressed that for the Soviet part, the door is open for constructive talks. This concerns the talks on medium-range nuclear missiles which are due to begin in Geneva on 30 November. They will probably be complicated, difficult talks, but the Soviet Union is approaching these talks guided by good will, guided by the aspiration to find an opportunity during these talks to achieve equilibrium of military forces between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, on a lower level than at present, and, preferably, on a substantially lower level.

Then, resumption of Soviet-U.S. talks on so-called strategic arms is expected in March-April -- that is, a return to the themes which were being resolved in the SALT II treaty.

Let me return to the arithmetic which I mentioned, with which the West is very busy when counting the various components of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and the armed forces of NATO, the various components of the Soviet Union and United States' armed forces.

Arithmetic, of course, is a clever thing, and nobody is disputing it. But one must go on to the next step; one must do algebra. And Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's interview, the Soviet stance, is permeated with this political algebra. The Soviet position is permeated with it when we propose the exclusion of nuclear war, when we propose rejection of first use of nuclear arms, which means rejecting the use of nuclear arms in general; when the Soviet Union comes out in support of gradual limitation of nuclear arsenals right up to their complete elimination. The successful solution of such algebraic formulas would, naturally, create the necessary climate of trust in the world, would create conditions to find acceptable solutions for limiting and curtailing other kinds of weapons, and it would, beyond dispute, open up broad political and economic opportunities for cooperation between states belonging to differing social systems.

There is no doubt whatsoever that Leonid Ilich's visit to Bonn, which is coming up very shortly, is a big and principled step being undertaken by Soviet policy in the interests of implementing the peace program adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress.

PONOMAREV COMMENTS ON U.S. DEFENSE BUDGET

LD191618 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 19 Nov 81

[By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov, TASS -- The U.S. House of Representatives on Wednesday voted for a new record-high military budget to the tune of 197,400 million dollars for the 1982 financial year, which is 26,000 million dollars more than in the past financial year. Besides, tranferred to the Pentagon's budget are additionally 30,000 million dollars from the unused funds for military programs of the recent years. Even people in the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives have to admit that the present sum of military appropriations is the largest one of all the U.S. legislators ever assigned for military purposes.

An analysis of the U.S. military appropriations shows that the Reagan administration, while talking for propagandist purposes about some "zero version", at the same time is building up its nuclear fist at an accelerated pace under the guise of various kinds of "additional nuclear arming", "modernisation", the elimination of some mythical U.S. vulnerability window, etc.

Partially included in the budget for the new financial year are already means for the realisation of Reagan's plan for the construction of the MX strategic missiles and the B-1 bomber. On the whole, in the coming six years, 180,300 million dollars is to be spent for these purposes and for the creation of other systems of strategic weapons.

As far as the medium-range nuclear missiles intended for deployment in Western Europe -- cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles -- are concerned, their production has already been started in the United States. This is acknowledged by the newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. According to the Pentagon's calculations, 5,000 million dollars are allocated for the production of the above-mentioned missiles.

In its budget for the 1982 financial year, in particular, the Reagan administration assigns 762,200 million dollars for the production of medium-range missiles and for their deployment in Europe.

This is what in actual fact is behind Washington's propagandist subterfuge! Such tricks are apparently intended for simpletons. By means of verbal jugglery, Washington politicians want to dodge the main, immutable principle in the cause of ensuring international security -- the principle of equality and equal security of the sides and mutual regard for each other's interests.

The USA will achieve nothing without observing this rule in arms limitation and disarmament matters.

U.S. VIEWS OF SOVIET ECONOMIC WOES 'DANGEROUS'

PM191657 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17 Nov 81 p 13

[Sandro Viola dispatch: "Brezhnev's Three Worries"]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 16 Nov -- I said to [Deputy Director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute] Oleg Bykov, one of the most lucid political analysts of the CPSU Central Committee's advisory group: "The Americans are insistently painting the following picture of the USSR in their newspapers: a major military power, but an almost pathetically weak economy. How accurate is this description?" Bykov ventured no denials or protests. "There is no doubt," he replied, "that this 5-year period and probably the next, too, will be among the most adverse in our recent history."

"Perhaps some false hopes were nurtured of the possibility of resolving in a few years the complex problems of the transition from an extensive to an intensive economy and so premature expectations emerged regarding the attainment of the so-called stage of efficiency and quality. In this regard the delays are evident, and more recently they have been joined by a number of difficulties in exploiting our natural resources (primarily energy resources) and the slowness and laboriousness of attempts to restructure the less efficient sectors of the economy. Not to mention moreover, the problems that have always existed both in central planning and in the management of enterprises...."

Vitaliy Zhurkin, Georgiy Arbatov's deputy director at the United States of America and Canada Institute, reacted somewhat more vigorously but essentially agreed with Bykov. "The Americans," he said, "really are extraordinary. On the one hand they describe us as 'supermen,' and indeed the Pentagon's white paper on Soviet military power states that we have extremely sophisticated helicopters, tanks and other weapons -- outright marvels of technology. On the other hand they do nothing but talk about our technological backwardness. Well, it is no mystery that our economy is experiencing a number of difficulties. There are huge obstacles in the attempt to increase productivity and there are also problems regarding resources, while U.S. restrictions on technology sales to the USSR (and its pressures on the Europeans to restrict their exports too) could create many difficulties for us in modernizing certain sectors of our production...."

But Zhurkin also issued a warning: "We clearly perceive the calculation that is seducing many people in the Reagan administration -- namely to force us to increase military spending so as to cause a crisis of catastrophic dimensions in our economy. Well, there is one thing that I would like to say. This is most dangerous and destabilizing not only for us but for the entire world situation. Because it would be really absurd if Washington were to underestimate our capabilities, our impetus of reaction."

Oleg Bykov said: "If the idea were to prevail in the United States that our economic difficulties will force us to adopt a different kind of international conduct, let us say a timid form of conduct, it could lead only to conflict. It is true that our domestic problems will become increasingly difficult the more we are forced to increase military spending, but no Soviet leadership will hesitate to tackle them as long as our defense capability is maintained. Meanwhile, the world will have become very dangerous."

APN'S KATIN VIEWS U.S. ARMS, MIDEAST POLICIES

NC191445 Beirut MONDAY MORNING in English 16-22 Nov 81 pp 50-54

["Exclusive article" by NOVOSTI news agency political commentator Vladimir Katin]

[Text] Many aspects of the international situation in our world in general, and in some parts of it -- including the Middle East -- in particular, are a function of the state of Soviet-American relations, which are inauspicious at the present time.

It is true that a glimmer of hope in the future is emerging after the two meetings which the Soviet foreign minister recently held in New York with Alexander Haig, the American secretary of state. As a result of these contacts, agreement was reached on the resumption of Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms in Geneva on November 30.

Moscow considers this a possible step, although it is overdue. For it had been possible to resume negotiations on this subject a long time ago, as the Soviet Union had repeatedly proposed. In fact, we might point out here that the talks need not have been interrupted at all. We recall, for the record, that the dialogue on the two countries' medium-range nuclear means was initiated in the first meeting of the Soviet and American delegates in Geneva in October of last year, and that all contacts were thereafter unilaterally broken off by the Carter administration.

In this respect, we wish to present a summary analysis of the Soviet concept of Soviet-American relations:

The Soviet Union has continuously strived to maintain normal relations with the United States, for there is no other wise alternative from the point of view of the interests of the two countries' peoples and the interests of mankind in general.

Unfortunately, however, neither the previous American administration nor the present one has sought the development of relations with the Soviet Union or the promotion of mutual understanding. Moreover, in an attempt to exert pressure on the Soviet Union, Washington has recently been undermining whatever positive achievements were made in Soviet-American relations through the not inconsiderable effort of the past years. As a result of this policy, contacts and cooperation between the two countries have deteriorated in many fields. The ratification of the SALT II treaty was suspended, for instance, and on other arms limitation matters, such as the reduction of arms exports to third countries, the United States has generally broken off negotiations with the Soviet Union.

With the advent of the Reagan administration to the White House, aggressive declarations and statements, saturated with the military spirit, have, regrettably been issuing from that direction, all aimed at poisoning the atmosphere of relations between Moscow and Washington. In contrast, the Kremlin has been calm and poised, hoping that America's policy-makers will eventually be able to develop a more realistic view of things. That, at any rate, is the hope of the Soviet capital.

Soviet political circles are convinced that the strategic military balance between the Warsaw Pact and NATO serves the purpose of preserving peace on earth. The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority, but at the same time Moscow will not permit such superiority over the socialist camp. As for the attempt to win in the arms race or the hopes of achieving victory in a nuclear war, these are nothing but an instance of dangerous insanity. This is the Soviet Union's view of this crucial issue of our age.

The Soviet Union believes that the present state of Soviet-American relations and the acuteness of many pending international problems dictate dialogue--effective dialogue at all levels--between the Soviet Union and the United States. And the Soviet Union is ready for such a dialogue.

While all this is true, the American Government has so far shown little readiness for dialogue and negotiations on the various international issues. Take, for example, the Middle Eastern issue, which has over the decades become a chronic problem.

In its quest for a position of dominance in the Middle East, Washington has taken the path of the Camp David policy--the path, in other words, of splitting the Arab world and establishing isolated collusion between Israel and Egypt. Time and events have shown the failure of American diplomacy to transform this collusion into a broader, capitulationist agreement, as it had initially hoped. But the United States did succeed in another direction: The crisis conditions in the region have been aggravated, especially after the departure of As-Sadat, and the settlement of the Middle Eastern conflict has receded.

What is to be done in such a situation? What is the way out? The Soviet Union believes that the issue can be pulled out of its state of stagnation by means of a genuine collective search for a comprehensive settlement built on foundations of realism and justice. In the present circumstances this can be done, for instance, in the framework of an international conference held expressly for that purpose. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in such an action with a constructive spirit of good will. The Soviet Union is prepared to do so in participation with all parties concerned, i.e. with the Arabs (including the Palestine Liberation Organization, of course) and Israel. And Moscow is prepared to carry out this quest with the United States.

We would mention, in this regard, that the Soviet Union and the United States had a certain experience involving this matter some years ago, and that the American side bears the responsibility for the lack of subsequent developments.

Regarding the essence of the issue, the Soviet Union's position remains unchanged, that position being that real peace in the Middle East necessitates the cessation of Israeli occupation of all Arab territories usurped in 1967, the granting of the full rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to establish an independent state, and the guarantee of the security and sovereignty of all the states of the region. These are the basic principles to which the Soviet Union adheres. As for the details, those of course, may be open to negotiation.

How has the United States responded to this? When it arranged the unilateral Camp David deal, it took the first step not towards a stable peace in the region but towards the formation of an anti-Arab military alliance, the pillars of which are the United States, Israel and Egypt. It has since pursued this to the extent of blatantly preparing for the long-term stationing of American forces in Sinai and other parts of the Arab world. And the United States' attempts to interfere in Egypt's internal affairs after the assassination of As-Sadat can be considered a challenge to all the Arab countries. The American Government's attention has been drawn to this by a Soviet Government communique which stated that internal developments in this or that state were no justification for the announcement of a state of maximum alert in American military units.

If we look back at American-Soviet relations, we find that in the last few years they have taken the form of a monologue by Moscow and not, unfortunately, the form of a dialogue. The Soviet Union has presented to the West, and to the United States in particular, many proposals relating to the slowing down of the arms race, the reduction of armed forces in Europe and the limitation of all types of weapons. In response, Washington has remained silent while at the same time striving to speed up the arms race, producing more advanced weapons, like the neutron bomb, for example, or its has replied that all this is very nice but it needs a great deal of study and there is no need to hurry. Given such a position on the part of the United States, there can be no serious, practical discussion, of course.

In several instances, the United States has tried to respond to the Soviet peace initiatives by making demands or setting preconditions. This is a strange attitude, to say the least. It means that the United States, while claiming for itself the right to behave as it wishes in almost all parts of the world, is demanding, as the "price" of its agreement to negotiate, that the Soviet Union forego the simplest safeguards for its security interests and refrain from helping its friends when they are the targets of aggression or threats of aggression. The Soviet Union will never accept such conditions, and the sooner the United States understand this, the better for everyone.

Let us imagine for a moment the Soviet Union announcing that before initiating negotiations on the settlement of urgent international issues, the United States must change its policy wherever the situation is not to Moscow's liking, that Washington must first pull its forces out of this or that country or from military bases overseas, for instance, and that Washington must stop arming this or that country in the Middle East. Can anyone take seriously such an attitude towards the question of negotiations? We don't think so.

Historical experience, including the experience of the last few decades, has proved beyond doubt that negotiations between nations cannot succeed unless all attempts at coercion and the dictation of preconditions are set aside, and until there is a genuine desire for peace and mutual respect of the parties' interests. It was precisely on that basis that a full set of Soviet-American agreements was reached, specifically the SALT I treaty and the SALT II treaty, the text of which has been finalized but has not been applied, and the blame for that belongs to the United States.

The reasons for the lamentable state of current relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are to be sought in the Reagan administration's continuous efforts, from the first hours of its existence, to raise tension. And all this for the accomplishment of a mission which has overshadowed all the other targets of the American administration -- namely, the acceleration of the arms race in its widest sense and in all fields. As Reagan's men strive to increase military strength and indulge in muscle-flexing, they naively believe that they can enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union from a position of strength. These are dangerous illusions, as they say in Moscow nowadays. The Soviet Union is a great power, and it will not permit the achievement of military superiority over it. It is this reality that must be taken as the starting point.

In imposing a new destructive round of the arms race on the world, the United States hopes to terrorize the Soviet Union, force it to stop supporting the struggle of peoples for freedom and independence, and undermine the strongholds of socialism. Washington considers its goal to be the destruction of detente and the liquidation of the valuable reserves of international trust which were built up throughout the seventies.

Washington is pursuing this intransigent line with the blatant support of several governments in Western Europe. However, millions of people in Western Europe -- indeed in the United States itself -- have, unlike their governments, come to realize what horrible disaster may be entailed by the flooding of Western Europe with nuclear explosives.

It is to be recalled that three countries -- namely, West Germany, England and Italy -- have so far agreed to accept American medium-range missiles. Now it is proposed that these missiles be complemented by neutron weapons, without consulting these countries. But what guarantee is there that the United States will not deploy these savage weapons in Turkey, for instance, which is the only NATO country in Asia? Some officials in Washington do not hide their view that the Iranian and Arab trouble-makers must be frightened with nuclear weapons, but that this would necessitate bringing the nuclear bases closer to the Near and Middle East. It is the view of American strategists that Turkey is the ideal bridgehead for these purposes. However, the interests of the Turkish people are as far removed from the interests of the United States as Ankara is from Washington.

Let us take a realistic view of matters? If the neutron bomb was deployed in the NATO countries, the Soviet Union would naturally not stand idly by and watch the hostile preparations in the territories of West Germany or England or any other NATO country. Rather, the Soviet Union would find itself forced to respond to this challenge in the appropriate manner, with a view to guaranteeing its security and the security of its allies in the Warsaw Pact. In the end, the arms race would escalate to a more dangerous level, which would not be compatible with the aspirations of the Arabs or the aspirations of the Europeans.

The Soviet Union believes that peace on our earth and the security of nations and peoples must be safeguarded not by increasing and developing nuclear-missile weaponry, nor by producing new kinds of such weaponry, but by limiting it on the basis of reciprocal treatment leading ultimately to a ban on it.

In conclusion, we wish to draw attention to the fact that the American media have recently resorted to a propaganda ruse, claiming that the countries of the Near and Middle East are exposed to the Soviet threat and that American presence is necessary "to save them."

In this regard, Moscow declares officially that the Soviet Union has no designs on any of the states of the Near and Middle East with which it has friendly and neighborly relations. Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union confronts the American principle of coercion and aggression with the principle of peace and security. More specifically, the five points proposed by Leonid Brezhnev towards the stabilization of the Arab Gulf region can be a good basis for the settlement of the situation that has arisen there.

U.S., NATO ANTI-SOVIET 'SPIRIT' CRITICIZED

PM191459 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 81 p 3

[Col V. Katerinich article: "The Militarization of Minds, the Ideological Conditioning of Servicemen in the NATO Countries' Armies"]

[Text] It has become clear that there has been a sharp turn toward greater aggressiveness in the policy of the United States and the other NATO countries. Militarist circles in these countries are demanding that international affairs be conducted solely on the basis of military force. They are bent on altering the current correlation of forces in the world arena and on achieving military superiority over the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact states. They are advancing one bellicose idea after another, each outdoing its predecessor and each openly or in a thinly disguised form advocating interference in the affairs of sovereign states, imperialist plunder and coercion, and war.

Among a broad cross section of the public in the NATO countries there is a growing realization of the threat posed by imperialism's militarist fever and adventurist plans. NATO's military ideologues have been watching with alarm the growth of the antiwar movement, which they fear may undermine the bloc's institutions and erode its foundations. The West German magazine STERN has pointed out that signs of "fear of the peace movement" have appeared in the organization of the North Atlantic bloc -- the imperialist states' instrument of war. The British newspaper THE DAILY TELEGRAPH said ruefully: "NATO's soft underbelly is now the European countries' morale, which has been flagging for some time and is suffering unprecedented blows from both within and without."

Reports that "the symptoms of flagging morale" are showing in the bloc members' armed forces are appearing increasingly frequently in the official NATO press. The U.S. Navy newspaper NAVY TIMES has, for example, complained of "a lack of patriotism and pride in their profession" among a considerable proportion of servicement. Many politicians and military figures holding leading NATO posts have been forced to admit that a considerable number of soldiers and officers "do not appreciate the nature and the gravity of the danger" and do not believe that the USSR poses a military threat.

This being so, the United States and the other North Atlantic bloc members have sharply intensified the activities of the propaganda machine and have launched a mass offensive to win people's minds.

"Not since World War II has Washington militarized propaganda and people's minds on the present scale. An outsider straying into our atmosphere might draw the natural conclusion that there is now no hope of a peaceful, nonmilitary solution of our problems and that from now on the only thing that counts is weapons of one sort or another," is how the well-known U.S. politician G. Kenna has described the current moral climate in the United States.

This climate is primarily characterized by a pathological hatred of communism and the Soviet Union. For a Soviet person living in a country where the advocacy of war, coercion, hostility and hatred are banned by law, it is difficult even to conceive of the irresponsible and openly inflammatory statements with which ordinary Americans, including servicemen, are showered daily.

Things are deliberately represented in such a way as to give the impression that the Soviet Union is about to move its troops into the United States and the other NATO countries and that they have no option but to prepare for war and to accelerate military preparations. Whereas several years ago the Soviet Union was generally described as "a potential adversary," it is now depicted by imperialist propaganda as "the main enemy." This enemy, it is claimed, must be fought everywhere -- in Asia, Africa and Latin America -- and with every available means, and it must be fought constantly and with increasing efforts.

A book by former U.S. President R. Nixon was published in the United States at the end of 1980. It was titled "The Real War." In it, the ex-president contends that world war III -- against the USSR -- began in the final phase of World War II. "It continues to this day and is now a real global and all-out war." All the wars recently fought by the United States and the other NATO countries, Nixon says, have been "the battles of world war III." At the present time, in the author's view, the United States has no option but to "mobilize all its resources and all its resolve to extend the struggle against the Soviet state."

The present U.S. administration's actions are entirely consistent with this exhortation. Secretary of State Haig's department has prepared a sort of guide to U.S. policy in the eighties. It calls for war, not peace, to be regarded as the normal state of relations between countries. The Pentagon has in turn prepared a "Defense Handbook: 1983-1987" which sets the task of "preparing to fight two-and-a-half wars simultaneously in any part of the world."

Realizing, however, that the "Soviet military threat" thesis has worn so thin that even the NATO countries have ceased believing it, the Atlanticist propagandists are resorting to other means of arousing a passion for war. In particular, the revampings of old ideas on the biological nature of the origin of wars are now appearing increasingly frequently in the Western military press. Characteristically, the book "Fighting Spirit, Psychological Factors in War" by Britain's Maj Gen F.M. Richardson is recommended in all the NATO countries as a sort of textbook on troops' morale. In his opus, the author claims in particular that despite the advent of mass-destruction weapons, wars are still inevitable since "man cannot escape his innate aggressiveness." "The fact is," Richardson pontificates, "man is a bellicose animal and loves war...he revels in danger."

As was the case many years ago, calumnies of this kind on man and his nature are being used by the bourgeoisie to mask the sociopolitical essence of war. Imperialism's inherent aggressiveness is deliberately being ascribed to man. Calumnies on man's nature are also being used to try to justify the thesis of the "inevitability" and "acceptability" of a nuclear war. Since war is inevitable, Western propagandists argue, the use of nuclear weapons is also inevitable. You need only, it is argued, familiarize soldiers with nuclear weapons' destructive properties and teach them how to defend themselves against them and their morale on the nuclear battlefield "will be maintained within the requisite framework."

The conclusion drawn from such claims is that the United States and NATO could win a nuclear war and that the fear of a nuclear war is little more than a "communist propaganda device." In his book "The Evolution of U.S. Army Nuclear Doctrine, 1945-1980," that prominent ideologue of U.S. militarism, D. Rose openly calls for "the development of thinking geared toward winning a nuclear war" and declares his support for a so-called "limited nuclear war."

It must not be thought that the NATO propagandists' clumsy attempts to pass nuclear weapons off as a benefit to the peoples has the understanding and support of the peoples themselves. Precious few people think the same way as the Atlanticists. They must not, however, be discounted. They express the views of those calling the tune in the imperialists states -- the representatives of the military-industrial complex and the leaders of the NATO military machine, who really run things and determine the character of troops and train and educate them.

Prompted by the increasing fears of the North Atlantic bloc's European members that they will be dragged into a nuclear missile war unleashed by the Americans, the United States has begun molding a "NATO spirit." This operation boils down to devising a variation on the "Atlantic solidarity" theme, making it explicitly reactionary, anticommunist and anti-Soviet. NATO's "solidarity" is in the shape of the idea of the Western world's unity in the face of the Soviet military threat." The U.S. magazine ARMED FORCES JOURNAL INTERNATIONAL has even proposed making the "NATO spirit" into a kind of religion to rally all the NATO armies.

The magazine left no one in any doubt that this "religion" should consist of everyone in NATO accepting "the U.S. leadership and the unity of interests determined in Washington" -- that is, total subordination to U.S. hegemonism and diktat.

The NATO mass media are now increasingly persistently pushing the idea of the need for and the rightfulness and importance of "U.S. leadership and a military presence in Europe." Despite the fact that the U.S. plan to deploy medium-range missiles and neutron weapons on the territory of the bloc's European members threatens them with nuclear devastation, it is proclaimed to be "a guarantee of security and order on the European Continent."

With a view to developing a "NATO spirit" new rituals and symbolism are being adopted increasingly assiduously in the armies of the North Atlantic bloc's members; various NATO competitions are being held, personnel exchanges are taking place and standardized forms of combat training are being introduced. At the present time, for example, the so-called "Red Flag" system of training pilots has been adopted by practically every NATO country's air force. Pilots are trained to engage in aerial combat against an "aggressor" using "the Russians' tactics" and flying aircraft resembling those in the Soviet Air Force's arsenal. For the same purpose, armies in the NATO countries have been given facilities for studying models of Warsaw Pact armies' armored weapons and small arms specially made and supplied by the United States. Personnel are shown the film "How To Combat Soviet Weapons."

Particular importance is attached to joint exercises of units, formations and groups [obedineniye] of the NATO countries' armies -- both national and multinational -- for inculcating the "NATO spirit." In the view of the U.S. military magazine SOLDIERS, their main virtue is that "the troops are training in places where there is a possibility of their being deployed in actual combat and are undergoing instruction using the weapons and combat hardware with which they will have to fight a war shoulder to shoulder with the people with whom they will have to work in a war situation."

All these facts again completely confirm the conclusion drawn at the 26th CPSU Congress that "adventurism and a willingness to gamble with mankind's vital interests for their own selfish ends are particularly nakedly revealed in the policy of imperialism's most aggressive circles."

The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are striving persistently for an improvement in the international situation. Their constructive peace proposals are meeting with understanding and support among the broad peoples' masses worldwide. At the same time, in the face of the imperialists' further acceleration of their material, political and ideological preparations for war, a high degree of vigilance and of preparedness to rebuff aggression are needed more than ever before.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA REVIEWS 'SCHWEITZER EPISODE'

PM191149 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 81 p 3

[V. Mikhaylov article: "How an American General Became a 'Scapegoat'"]

[Text] The former U.S. secretary of state, J. F. Dulles, once said: "In order to get the country to accept the burden demanded by maintaining powerful armed forces, it is necessary to create an emotional atmosphere approaching military hysteria. It is necessary to arouse fear of an outside danger." This is the aim now set by certain American political and military figures.

The members of the annual conference of the Association of the United States Army, held in late October, were addressed by Maj Gen Robert Schweitzer, leader of the military group on the National Security Council. He started off in the usual anti-Soviet key, or so it seemed.

But this person apparantly did not consider the standard theme of the "Soviet military threat" to be enough. (Perhaps another task was set him). He started to intimidate those present by speaking of the "greatest danger in U.S. history" allegedly now hanging over the United States and called on the leadership in the White House and the U.S. NATO allies to immediately "step up preparations for nuclear war." "The Soviet Union," the general told those present, "has moved onto the offensive and is preparing to make a strike." Who knows what Gen R. Schweitzer was seeing at that moment? Perhaps he saw Soviet tank divisions making an underwater crossing of the Atlantic and, tracks clattering, emerging on the east coast of the American Continent. Let us recall that at the time of the cold war an even more prominent U.S. military leader jumped out of the window because of similar visions. Now the atmosphere in U.S. militarist circles is similar to what it was in the cold war years, and this evidently tends to cause such hallucinations among certain weak-nerved U.S. military figures.

This hawk's threats were not only aimed at the USSR. Also on the receiving end were the U.S. NATO allies, which he reproached because European countries have grown "soft and sleepy from 30 years of peace" and think that the peace will continue in subsequent decades. The speaker called on the allies to "assess the threat soberly and prepare for war," not peace. It was clear that the general was particularly concerned about European pacifist and neutralist trends and also the reluctance of certain European countries to make sacrifices for the purpose of direct preparations for war.

After lecturing the Europeans, Schweitzer turned to the problems of Latin America. He called hysterically for the path for seditious ideas to penetrate that continent to be closed. In Schweitzer's assessment, Latin America is "on fire" and the "communists are to blame," of course. The general made it clear that the present Washington administration intends to adopt measures to give military assistance to pro-American regimes and to give lessons in how to deal with the liberation movement.

Nor did Schweitzer forget other "regions of vital importance" for the United States. He called for American soldiers to become firmly based on Saudi Arabian territory, and this must begin, in his opinion, with deliveries of AWACS planes there. After all, the deal to supply these weapons systems -- worth $8.5 billion -- was all but intercepted by the French or the British, who could have supplied similar complexes to the Saudis. But the deal was not only business. Something else is more important to American interests in the Near East. The AWACS planes will be accompanied to Saudi Arabia by hundreds of American servicemen with various specialities. The network of CIA agents can be extended under this cover. American crews will fly the planes, and the personnel at the air bases will also be American. That is precisely what the Pentagon wants.

Many people, even those who support the aggressive U.S. course, were put in a difficult position by these frank militarist statements on Schweitzer's part, and they asked: What an act of irresponsibility on the part of a disobedient, high-handed military official who holds a responsible post on the U.S. National Security Council? His speech, which was aimed at kindling anti-Soviet hysteria, fell completely within the general line of the "Soviet military threat" campaign which has been launched in the United States and the propagandization of the arms race, adding the demand for direct preparations for war, which, in R. Schweitzer's words, is already at the United States' door.

By the standards of leading Pentagon circles, this hawk might as well have been praised as a true fighter "for a strong America."

However, it was announced that Richard Allen, administrative director of the National Security Council, had decided to relieve Schweitzer of his post.

So the following questions spring to mind: What is happening, gentlemen, if you please? What has the general suffered for? What did he say that went beyond the bounds of Washington's policy?

It turned out that the solution was simple. Schweitzer's speech was aimed at a remote target: It was a kind of touchstone to see how far the American public had been attuned to the idea of the inevitability of a military confrontation with the Soviet Union. If the speech did not pass muster, they would say that his remarks were "private assessments and interpretations" and did not reflect the President's viewpoint.

The speech by the herald of war caused extreme indignation among the broad public in the United States, and also in a number of NATO countries. The West Europeans, who are gradually being prepared for the role of U.S. hostage in a nuclear war, are running out of patience. The open appeals for war put the masters of the White House in an awkward position, as they had not expected such a sharply negative public reaction. So they decided, for the time being, to dissociate themselves from the facsist statements of a National Security Council official. It was necessary to show, if only for appearances' sake, that official Washington does not support instigators of war. Playing up to public opinion, the administration relieved Schweitzer of his post.

So the zealous American general became a "scapegoat." But was he really shouting louder than everyone else about things which are now common currency in the United States? It was simply that Schweitzer tried a bit too hard and spoke frankly about matters which politicians usually speak of more vaguely and cautiously. In the long term this "Schweitzer episode" and other bellicose speeches by Pentagon leaders are deliberately exploited by the administration in order to create an atmosphere of war hysteria in the country and back up the course of militarization as a stable form of U.S. state policy.

How is the "general's punishment" to be assessed? Judge for yourselves -- the "punished" man was soon received in the White House by the top leadership and transferred to a respectable post in the Department of the Army, where he has the opportunity to work in practice on the implementation of his "ideas."

BEIJING SEEKING TO DISRUPT USSR-U.S. ARMS TALKS

LD200702 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0555 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov (TASS) -- In an attempt to create difficulties in advance for the upcoming Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe, the Beijing provocateurs are "yet again confirming how incompatible their selfish plans are with the vital interests of all the peoples of the planet who are striving to find effective ways to halt the arms race," PRAVDA writes today.

In the rejoinder, "The Inciters," the paper says the Beijing politicians are not pleased with the prospect that the talks could result in lowering the level of confrontation which would open the way for further steps toward military detente in Europe. The Beijing politicians see the worsening of international tension as a prerequisite for carrying out their hegemonistic desires. This is the reason for their attempts to poison in advance the atmosphere surrounding the upcoming talks.

PRAVDA comments that Beijing is trying to come forward in the role of "adviser" to the NATO countries. The provocative, ill-intentioned nature of their "advice" is obvious. They are whispering to Washington that its representatives should behave "correctly" -- that is, not take one step toward the constructive proposals of the USSR. Beijing is "advising" Western European countries to follow obediently in Washington's wake, pushing their national interests into the "background."

The Beijing opponents of international cooperation, the paper continues, come out especially vehemently against the principle of trust, reciprocity and equality which the USSR consistently defends. They call on the United States and other NATO countries "not to give in" to the Soviet proposals on substantial mutual nuclear arms reductions in Europe, slanderously maintaining that the USSR is "imposing stiff conditions on Europe." The provocative aim of such fantasies is obvious, PRAVDA emphasizes.

RENMIN RIBAO Commentary

PM171517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 81 p 5

[B. Barakhta "Rejoinder": "Empty Sack"]

[Text] The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO has published a special commentary "On the Prospects of Talks Between the Soviet Union and the United States on Nuclear Arms Control in Europe." This it is indeed an important problem deserving attention. As is well known, the Soviet proposals on key problems of international life, imbued with the desire to avert the threat of war from mankind, generated a broad response throughout the world. However, it is futile to seek in the RENMIN RIBAO commentary even a semblance of a realistic, objective approach to the peace-loving initiatives of the land of the soviets.

Just one thing can be seen in the commentary: The frank desire to prevent a thaw in the international climate to persuade the United States and NATO countries that it is "possible and necessary" to achieve military superiority over the USSR and give new impetus to the intensification of the arms race. To this end RENMIN RIBAO is making out that the Washington administration's dangerous decision to deploy medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe is an "essential," "forced" measure allegedly undertaken in response to some "provocative" steps by the Soviet Union. Turning everything upside down, the newspaper's commentator, without the slightest embarrassment, alleges that U.S. imperialism not only advocates nuclear weapons control, but is also demanding effective arms reduction in Europe. As for the Soviet proposals, in Beijing's opinion all that is "an offensive under the flag of negotiations" with a view to obtaining "one-sided military superiority."

RENMIN RIBAO set about tackling a wittingly futile task when it conceived, in conjunction with U.S. propaganda, the idea of frightening the world with demagogic arguments about the "Soviet military threat." It is appropriate to recall here the old Chinese proverb: "An empty sack cannot be stood upright."

RADIO COMMENTS ON UN DISCUSSION OF AFGHANISTAN

LD201124 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1400 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] The United Nations General Assembly has finished discussing what it calls the Afghan problem. Our commentary is by Vladimir Korotkov.

The United States, its NATO allies and China managed, in violation of the United Nations Charter, to push a resolution through the Assembly that amounts to outright interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country. The representatives of many nations were misled by the vociferous claims of Western propaganda regarding the reasons for the situation involving Afghanistan. As a result, on the pretext that the Afghans have a right to decide their future without interference from the outside, the Assembly passed a resolution calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan, the foreign troops being the limited Soviet contingent.

On the surface this would seem the correct thing to do, but let's take a closer look at the matter. Just who is interfering in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and why are Soviet troops in the country? The changes that came about in Afghanistan after the revolution of April 1978 conflicted with the interests of the United States and China and their allies in southwest Asia. Those countries rushed to reduce trade with Afghanistan and pressured the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and other financial bodies under the thumb of the United States to go back on their commitments to Afghanistan. One of the world's most backward countries even stopped getting help under the United Nations world food program. In addition, Washington and Beijing saw to it that bands of mercenaries were formed to try to bring down popular government in Afghanistan and set up a government that would do their bidding.

The armed aggression finally took on such menancing proportions that it threatened the sovereignty of Afghanistan and could have developed into a major conflict. It was then that the Afghan Government turned to the Soviet Union for help. In doing so it acted in line with the right proclaimed in the United Nations Charter of a sovereign country to protect itself, and in line with Afghanistan's treaty of friendship, neighborly relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union. The arrival of Soviet troops saved the Afghan people, but upset the schemes of the United States and China.

In forcing the United Nations to demand the withdrawal of foreign troops, the enemies of Afghanistan would like to deprive the Afghan people of protection from the mercenary bands that are acting on an ever greater scale. It is significant that during the United Nations debate one of the directors of the undeclared war against Afghanistan arrived in Islamabad. This was the chief of staff of the Chinese Army, Yang Dezhi. His purpose was to stimulate the bands now operating out of Pakistan. In return he promised their leaders new weapons from China. Washington too is investing heavily in the undeclared war against Afghanistan.

WORK PROGRESSING ON UZBEK-AFGHAN BRIDGE

WA201000 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 5 Nov 81 p 2

[UZTAG report "Bridge Across the Amudarya"]

[Text] Builders of the highway-railroad bridge across the Amudarya have disembarked on the southern -- Afghan -- bank of the river. Anatoliy Lisenkov's brigade of assemblers began the assembly work on the seventh span with the help of powerful cranes ferried across on barges. At the same time Nikolay Piskayev's brigade completed work on the final -- 10th -- pier of the transport crossing. Both collectives from the 32nd detachment of the Tashkent trust "Mostostroy-7" are surpassing the time-frame norm for construction by approximately 1 year. The acceleration was achieved as a result of a model organization of labor and efficient cooperation with the supplier -- the Kurgan plant for bridge metal construction.

Traffic on the new bridge is projected for May of next year.

'PROVOCATIONS' IN POLAND PROMPT SEJM WARNING

LD192242 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Warsaw:

Despite the measures taken by the leadership of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and the government of the Polish People's Republic aimed at normalizing the situation in the country, antisocialist groups and elements, primarily from among Solidarity extremists, are continuing to provoke disorder. They are paralyzing the activity of local state and economic organs and inspiring more and more strikes. In the last few days alone they have succeeded in causing disorder in more than 30 voivodships in the republic. Rural Solidarity is organizing acts of sabotage which are complicating the supply of foodstuffs to towns.

Attention is drawn to the fact that recently the leaders of the Confederation for Independent Poland have submitted in several Polish towns a brazen demand for legalization of the activity of this counterrevolutionary organization, which as is known, is linked with the American CIA. On the initiative of the confederation, counterrevolutionary forces in the country are unleashing a campaign for the liquidation of PZPR party committees at enterprises and establishments.

At the session of the Sejm Presidium at the Polish People's Republic held yesterday, a statement was adopted which states: Some days ago the Sejm unanimously called for the preservation of public calm. However social tension is being observed in the country which is threatening the security of the state and the people. Strikes are being used for the purpose of resolving questions which it is possible and necessary to settle by other means. The statement stresses that if the call is not heeded and a threat arises to the national existence of the people, the Sejm will examine a proposal to grant to the government such legally provided means which are required by the situation in the country.

PATIENCE WITH SOLIDARITY EXHAUSTED IN POLAND

PM201115 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Nov 81 p 14

[Report by special correspondent Arkadiy Sakhnin: "Solidarity? No, Counterrevolution"]

[Text] Warsaw-Gdansk-Katowice-Bydgoszcz-Moscow -- I had been in Poland in better days. I remember the last time I left Warsaw. I walked with a group of Polish friends to the station along brightly lit Marszalkowska Street, more of a boulevard really, which was filled with happy people bubbling with life. The street was bathed in the flashing neon lights of the advertisements. Quiet, cozy cafes alternated with the handsome windows of stores and noisy bars pumping out music to which young people danced on the sidewalk. It felt good.

...Back on Marszalkowska. The streetlights are dim. The faces are long and tired and there are lines outside the stores where coupons are required to buy goods.

In one year Poland's development has suffered an enormous setback. And who knows how much time it will take to pick up the pieces and restore normal life in the country.

How has this come about?

I am not going to talk about the situation in Poland although I have just come back from there. There is scarcely any need -- the major shifts in the country's political, social and economic life have been adequately covered in the press.

I will just describe what I saw with my own eyes on the spot or on television, heard on the radio or from people who participated in the events prior to the PZPR Central Committee's 4th Plenum, which elected Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski as Central Committee first secretary.

What is it like on the surface? Warsaw, indeed all five cities I visited, is awash with leaflets, appeals, artistic placards -- in color and in black and white -- slogans and newspapers clearly stamped with the word "Solidarity." You can see all this on the walls of apartment buildings, on fences, theater hoardings, buses, streetcars and special kiosks. Pamphlets are handed out on the street and are pushed into mailboxes and every available chink. Throughout the day and deep into the night the word Solidarity rings out on national television and radio, from the loudspeakers of plant and factory radio stations and at numerous rallies, meetings and conferences. As you approach industrial centers, from afar the outlines of the plant buildings are barely discernible. It hits you in the eye with its brightness like a factory sign as if it were the name of the enterprise -- Solidarity. All this has a stunning, stupefying effect.

But what does this magnetic, noble word mean in today's Poland? What kind of organization is it and how does it operate?

Its ringleaders, who hate each other but all have the same dream of a capitalist Poland, have striven for many years with their own separate teams to undermine the people's system and erode it to the point of collapse.

All methods were used by the forces of counterrevolution to attack the socialist system as a whole. Carefully concealing this and hypocritically stressing their devotion to the system, they set up Solidarity in the guise of a trade union association. At first they came out with highly attractive economic slogans -- which, however, were unrealistic and unviable.

At the "Katowice" metallurgical plant I spent a long time looking through a fat, large-format book listing 5,200 demands, or postulates as they are called there. They were put forward at innumerable meetings and conferences in shops and other plant sections. They were not spontaneous phenomena. They were carefully prepared by the Solidarity bosses' stooges at the plant, but they took the form of a spontaneous action, which is what Solidarity wanted. "The workers want to tell the management what they think -- there's nothing wrong with that." And it was to the accompaniment of the demagogic slogans proclaimed by Solidarity that this campaign of putting forward postulates began. Then representatives of the management and party, trade union and other organizations studied them, and they realized that they could not cope with them by themselves. They split the postulates up into separate sections -- the housing problem, wages, working conditions and so forth -- 11 sections, about 500 postulates in each. And they set up 11 commissions which set about studying them. Whenever anyone expressed a doubt about the possibility of meeting a demand, a Solidarity representative would immediately pipe up, threatening a strike. So all 5,200 postulates were adopted.

If you were to set aside the ridiculous and absurd demands -- which account for most of them -- and meet all the others, you would have a paradise. That is what the Solidarity representatives were demanding, totally ignoring what was possible. Who would refuse to live in paradise! That is what Solidarity wants, so you must support the organization and join it.

As Edward Gawarecki, plant party committee secretary, told me, it was those who shouted loudest who got elected to Solidarity's leading organs. "This one will protect our interests." But even when they had gotten among the leaders they certainly did not rest their voices.

Again people sat down to examine the postulates. They were numbered and the numbers were entered in groups and columns like a multiplication table, in a book with an indication of when the particular number would be fulfilled, who was responsible for what numbers and so forth.

Dozens and dozens of people -- plant leaders, shop chiefs and party, trade union and social figures spent months working on the postulates. The nearly 20,000-strong plant collective attended innumerable meetings. And what about the plant? It is supposed to provide 4.5 million tons of steel. People also have to guide a production process in which there are many urgent production problems.... But there was not time for that.

There was a shortage of steel so badly needed by the country, and this disrupted the work of enterprises for which it was bound. But Solidarity had a powerful means of influencing people -- indeed, it is impossible to meet 5,200 demands. And they never tire of yelling that the management does give a damn for its workers.

"What can you do," the party committee secretary replied. "Solidarity has made demagoguery and strikes instruments of struggle for illegal demands."

I will be talking in detail about how the strikes are organized, but for clarity's sake I must digress a little.

It would be a big mistake to think that Solidarity is a united, integrated organization of people of like mind. There are several warring groups in its leadership -- from social democrats to fascists. But stronger than their enmity is the factor which unites them -- hatred of People's Poland. Playing on the mistakes made by the former leadership, relishing each of them, whipping up emotions, proclaiming pseudodemocratic slogans and making fine but as yet unfulfilled promises, the Solidarity bosses managed to recruit many Polish working people. But even the mass of ordinary Solidarity members is far from homogeneous. There are people who are dissatisfied with something or other (bad housing conditions, modest wages, upset about unfair treatment and so forth). There are people who have simply been deceived by the fine phrases, gullible people who find it difficult to see through the manipulations of political adventurists. Many people were pushed into the "trade union" by others: "Come on, everyone's joining except you." And thousands joined as a result of blackmail and threats. At the beginning of the trade union association's activity the atmosphere and psychological pressure were such that it was awkward if not impossible not to join Solidarity.

The mass of Polish working people remain loyal to the ideas of socialism and to their system. Then why do they strike?

This will become clear when we talk about another category of Solidarity members. Making fascists of youth elements are its bosses' buttress and decisive force. They are wild, brazen and cruel, dreaming of an easy, daredevil and rollicking sort of life. They are prepared to crush and destroy everything in their path without a thought, without consideration, and to desecreat sacred graves, whooping and whistling all the while. They are Polish Red Guards.

Blasphemy -- the Solidarity bosses call them "marshaling groups," so they marshal.... Here's how they marshal.

This is what Jan Zielesnki, first secretary of Sosnowiec Party City Committee, told me.

Sosnowiec was liberated from the Hitlerites by the 58th Army under the command of Gen Ivan Terentyevich Korovnikov in January 1945. The city was in ruins. Now it has 2 metallurgical plants, a ball-bearing plant, an engine plant and 2 textile factories -- a total of 80 industrial enterprises. And Solidarity is pushing large forces into our workers center. They find it easy to operate: more meat, more butter and apartments immediately, they yell. If you don't give them to us we will strike. People know that it is not that easy but they keep on striking. Why? Go to any enterprise; they will tell you.

...There were several of us in the party committee building at the "Sosnowiec" mine. Party city committee Second Secretary Adam Szpruch was the first to speak. We are at a large, modern mechanized mine, he said. You won't see any tips here -- the coal is processed on ths spot and dispatched. The old miners remember when the main implement was the pickax, which is now found only in musuems. The enterprise was modernized by the people's system. The coal is mined at various depths. Some 4,700 people work at the mine and they produce 7,500 tons of high-quality coal per day.

Coal to Poland is like sugar to Cuba. Coal exports are the country's chief source of revenue. Therefore every ton is important to us. Nonfulfillment of the plan immediately affects the work of other enterprises and disrupts supplies of fuel to the population. A strike at the mines has a disastrous effect on the entire economy.

"Why do we allow the strikes to happen?" Janusz Nawrot, first secretary of the mine party committee, echoed my question. "Judge for yourself."

He is 48. He has worked at mines for 32 years. He began by wielding the pick and went through all the stages of the mining trade. He comes from a long line of miners. He is serious, sober-minded and a man of authority.

"Judge for yourself," he says again. "For example, on 7 August Solidarity urged the workers to declare a 4-hour strike as a protest against the breakdown of its talks with the government. In fact, as it turned out later, it was Solidarity which had unceremoniously and brazenly wrecked the talks.

"So, at about 0600 around 400 miners assembled in the hall where people come before they start work, where they collect their work schedules -- the dressing rooms, washrooms and showers are next door. I was the first at the microphone. I explained the reasons for the breakdwon of talks and called upon them to start work. Then mine director Tadeusz Nowak made a brief speech. It wasn't a speech really, just an announcement. 'Those who want to strike,' he said, 'are free to do so. For those who want to work there is work and they can go down.'"

"I spoke third," said Sylwester Podgorski, chairman of the sector trade union.

He too comes from a long line of miners and has worked at this mine since 1956, that is, for more than 25 years. He began by shoveling coal and is now in an important elected office.

"I simply read the sector trade union's appeal to the workers," he continued. "Then sanitary engineer Wojciech Figiel, the local Solidarity leader, came to the microphone. He is 28 and has been at the mine only a few days. An insolent, malicious type, prepared to perpetrate all kinds of provocations, he began to urge strike action. The miners listened a while and then moved off to the cages in small groups. Most of them were Solidarity members. The audience dwindled. As he talked his associates handed him cards on which, it turned out later, was written: 'Such and such a seam has started working,' 'such and such a pit has started up,' 'the coal grader is operating.' That meant coal had reached the surface! Figiel's audience had dwindled to a couple of dozen. "'What do we do?' they asked him. 'What do we do, indeed?' He asked the same question and tears appeared in his eyes. He realized he had failed and his career had failed too."

"At 0645 hours," Hanusz Nawrot took up the story, "the mine began to work at full capacity. I came up here to my office, looked through some papers, listened to the news at 0700 and went to see the mine director. The chief engineer was already there. Only later did we find out what Figiel was up to at that time. He had phoned the Slask-Dabrowa Solidarity regional committee and they immediately dispatched a gang of 'marshals.' Led by these out-and-out thugs, about 30 people burst into the director's office in a frenzied state, eyes blazing, and demanded: 'Clear the building immediately.' That was at 0725.

"Tadeusz Nowak clamly said: 'I am the director and even Solidarity accepts that I am responsible for the mine irrespective of whether there is a strike or not, and I am going nowhere.'

"'We are the strike committee,' they bellowed at him. 'We are taking over,' and several people made threatening lunges at him.

"What could we do? We went, not knowing where. They took us down a long corridor, pushed us into the conference room and locked us in."

"After that," Sylwester Podgorski said, "about 20 people from the same crowd burst in on me. 'If you don't leave of your own accord we'll make you leave.' How could I fight them? They grabbed me by the shirt and dragged me. I was also stuffed into the conference room. Soon the commercial director was led in. There was a strong guard at the entrance and in the room.

"Here the cages take people down from 0600 to 0730 because work begins at different levels at different times," he continued. "For instance, they go down to seam '400' at about 0730. But those who arrived for that time were not allowed into the mine. They began to organize a rally. First they mustered those who work on the surface and those who had been unable to go down and then they burst in on the controller and ordered him to bring people up to the surface. The controller was not pleased: 'What, a rally in worktime?' 'Anybody who does not come up will be dismissed immediately,' came the order. And people began to make for the exists.

"The load-carrying cages were stopped at 0800 and coal extraction ceased. The 'marshaling group' lost all sense of proporation at the rally. They dragged out of the mine a group of workers who had refused to come up, taunted them and led them to the microphone. But the remained silent, as did most of the others. Maybe they would have said to hell with it all and returned to the mine, but they were well aware that the ventilation water discharge pump controls are on the surface. And with these anything could happen. There had already been cases at other mines where the air pipes had been stuffed with clay and people had been forced up to the surface.

"Around 1000 the prosecutor arrived at the mine. They wouldn't let him see us. They sent him away. At exactly 1000 the Red Guards came to the conference room and told the director: 'Sign a paper saying that you opposed the strike and that the mine carried on working and therefore we are extending the strike to 1300. The director refused. Nevertheless, the cages did not move before 1300.

"At 1245 they released us, sneeringly stating: 'You have 15 minutes to make the people work. Just try.'"

And What Then?

"What then, indeed: The result was that on that day the shortfall at the mine was 4,000 tons. Figiel is going to work laughing and shouting at people despite the fact that the prosecutor instituted criminal proceedings and, having completed inquiries long ago, committed him for trial. But the case has not been tried yet. Why? For the same reason that (Arent) from the Sciglowice mine has not been tried. He and his thugs wheeled out the sector trade union chairman in a wheelbarrow. (Arent) was arrested and his chums organized a protest strike very like ours, They were out for 7 days. They lost 100,000 tons of coal during that period. To prevent further losses he was released by order of the authorities."

Answering my question, the party committee secretary said;

"Of course, I spoke with the communists. And they asked: 'Did they lock you up with the mine leaders? They did. And were any of those who became violent locked up? No. Right, when you lock them up and we don't feel defenseless any more, then you can make demands on us.'"

Listening to him I was reminded of a conversation with a militia man in Warsaw who talked of the disgraceful hooligan acts by the thugs from the "marshaling groups."

From talking with him I realized that the militia would be perfectly capable of handling them, but it lacks the instructions.

Calling strikes on any pretext and forcing people to stop working, Solidarity deals brutally with those who will not submit to it. So it was in Gdansk at the printing office which printed Solidarity's product. The leaders' promises to the print workers were not kept so the workers came out on strike. A gang of "marshals" moved in immediately, wielding iron bars. Under threat of physical violence the workers went back to work.

I asked the general prosecutor, Comrade Bubinski, whether there has been many prosecutions as a result of crimes committed by Solidarity members.

"There have been many prosecutions," he replied, "but on various pretexts the courts are not passing sentence. The prosecutor protests to a higher court, but the higher court turns down the protest. So it comes to me and my protests are turned down too."

Even before this conversation I had heard of similar instances. For example, criminal proceedings were instituted against M. Zembrzuski for publicly calling for the overthrow of the system. But the court released him saying that he was the only breadwinner in a family of three. Apart from him there was his wife and child. The prosecutor appealed the decision. Eventually the case will go to a higher court, but in the meantime the criminal goes free.

These facts and what the general prosecutor said made me wonder: Has Solidarity copied the example of the Chilean junta? I was there when it happened. There too undermining the economy was the main means of seizing power. When I asked Ramiro Mendez, who was then chairman of the Chilean Supreme Court, how he could let the organizer of a drivers' strike go free when he had been found in possession of a stack of ammunition and weapons, he looked amazed: "I didn't simply let him go. He was released temporarily on bail."

The bail amounted to the equivalent of R1.5.

By gradually stepping up their economic claims, making more and more political demands, trying to gain control of the mass news media and inciting people to oppose the system and the law, the Solidarity bosses have ceased to disguise their true aims. The end is to seize power, and the means to that end is the undermining of the economy. That emerged very unambiguously from the so-called Solidarity congress. It was a carefully planned spectacle, financed by Western special services. The U.S. concern, IBM, and others provided electronic equipment worth $160,000 for the spectacle free of charge. Computers were brought in which at the request of the audience produced laudatory comments about the Solidarity ringleaders.

At the Oliwia sports complex where it all happened there appeared a mass of stalls and stands displaying badges, pennants, postcards, leaflets and literature calling for the overthrow of the system. The illegal "Independent Publishing Insitute" published 150 titles, including pamphlets and books by Brzezinski, Mlynar and Michnik, which were legally distributed in the arena. There were floodlights, arc lamps and the blink of flashguns. The loudspeakers relaying the proceedings were blaring out. It was a veritable orgy. Extreme reaction was really letting itself go with everyone trying to outdo everyone else in slandering the socialist system. Nothing about how to get out of the crisis, how to boost the economy and improve people's lives. As for the questions which are currently worrying the whole world -- not a word against "limited nuclear war," not a word about the struggle for peace. But there were speeches of another kind.

Here are some excerpts recorded on various days. In my view they show the atmosphere at the assemblage and reflect, to some extent, the viewpoint of most Solidarity members.

The representative from Zielona Gora: "The electorate believes that the KKP (National Consultative Commission made up of Solidarity leaders -- A. Sakhnin) would be very successful in Westerns and adventure movies. Not because the KKP members are particularly good-looking, but only because their activity is reminiscent of brinkmanship. The trade union rank and file are tired of brinkmanship. They are tired of the constant uncertainty, not knowing what tomorrow will bring, what is going to happen from one minute to the next. The personal battles which are taking place even now in this hall and have taken place at the KKP are very unpleasant. The fact that two members of the KKP Presidium can meet at the door and not shake hands with one another is also very unpleasant. All these relationships were reflected by the KKP report which was submitted to us here. We have read enough reports like this. Repcrts about everything and about nothing."

The representative from Szczecin: "...It is a fact that Rulewski nags Walesa, Walesa nags Gwiazda, and Gwiazda nags Bujak and perhaps someone else. I ask: Is it possible that in such a hornet's nest they are struggling to achieve our highest aims and championing the working people's interests? Isn't there a struggle going on for the chair, for who will be this supreme commander in chief, this director or some other leader...?"

The delegate from Czestochowa: "We are observing a struggle for posts in our trade union. This struggle is taking place right at the top. I consider this very bad."

The chairman: "Pan Barczo will speak now. I once again call on the hall. There are very many empty seats. I also ask the services employed to establish order to exercise effective control over movement in the hall."

The representative from the Bydgoszcz region: "...What have we given people? We have given them cards which do not provide goods. We have given them lines that do not grow shorter. At the same time the KKP Presidium adopts a decision on high pay for trade union leaders. We ourselves get a high wage, much higher than the average worker (cries of 'bravo') from the hall). We rest while the motherland is buckling at the knees. I pay tribute to the KKP members who in August assumed the full weight of responsibility. However, they have not seen it through. Certain KKP members have soared so high into the sky, like falcons, that from there they have lost sight of ordinary people with their everyday needs, and I regard them rather as crows...."

The chairman: "I urgently request the marshaling service to remind delegates of their duty to participate in sessions. Look at the hall. At present there are, perhaps, at most 50 people here. This shows a frivolous attitude.

"We can achieve something only when one person speaks while the others listen. Otherwise this will be a little sejm of the gentry. I ask for quiet."

The representative from Wroclaw: "Internal enemies are a considerable danger to us -- namely, those who have instantly transformed themselves from wolves by putting on sheepskins and want to lead the trade union. I consider this a very great danger. And I personally oppose all manipulations of this sect, the sect that is implementing this program."

The chairman: "Our electors are outside the building. The following letter has come from them: 'The people gathered around the Oliwia hall are critical of the fact that delegates leave the hall during sessions. This is the Solidarity congress, and we chose delegates to sit in the hall and adopt the most correct decisions for society.'"

The representative from the Mazowsze region: "I would like to broach the question of wages for trade union staff members. The wages of certain individuals are very high. Our trade union was created for the workers, but the leaders draw a wage of 20,000 zlotys. This should not be. First we should do something for the workers, and then take money for it. (applause)

"I believe that the figures, in other words the generals, such as Bujak, Rulewski and others, have forgotten that they themselves were workers getting 6,000 zlotys. Now they get 15,000.

"And there's no sign of them in the enterprises."

The representative from Gdansk: "Note how certain people here make fine speeches, temporizingly look us in the eye and charm us with the words 'democracy,' 'national independence' and revision of trade agreements and, perhaps, even military agreements. What Pole would not subscribe to the slogan 'democracy' or 'independence'? And some even want to amuse us and spread nice illusions that we will have El Dorado in 15 months. Let us not create illusions. The greatest misfortune has not yet come. And note how certain people fawn upon us and beg us to like them and choose them as our leaders."

The representative from the central-eastern region: "I consider this a congress of academics. Words are used most of which I do not understand (cries of 'bravo'). If you want to debate in this way, organize a congress without us."

The representative from Subcarpathia: "Observing the KKP people, I have noticed that workers speak less and less, that they cannot find room amid the stream of intellectual twaddle....I believe that they have pulled out of the KKP because, being workers, they could not find room for themselves there. They stopped being considered some time ago...."

When Solidarity's bosses saw that the number of such speeches was increasing all the time and the program still had to be adopted, they proposed cutting the time limit for speakers from 5 to 2 minutes. The proposal was rejected. Then they decided to end the speeches altogether. However, one of the representatives from Zieldna Gora still forced his way onto the rostrum. He said: "Go to the collectives and tell the workers and their wives that you silenced those who would like to formulate the program, those who do not let the views of experts who have lost touch with reality be foisted on them. Tell people that you are in a great hurry to get home.

"I beg you to rescind your decision to silence those who were elected by their voters and whom the voters have charged with conveying the people's problems to the congress."

Debunking one of Solidarity's leaders, the representative from West Pomerania expressed himself in the same spirit, declaring in particular: "It sometimes seems to me that neither I nor the other delegates in the hall are needed at all and that the elections were just a formality."

The BULLETIN FAKTY, published by the PZPR voivodship committee in Katowice, carried "Observers Notes" by Jan Prosta, who, in particular, cites statements by his fellow countrymen from Silesia. One of them declared: "Never in my life have I seen such a farce. The opening was delayed by 90 minutes, and on the second day the sessions were 58 minutes late starting and a 30-minute break was announced 40 minutes later. There were occasions when we did not know if the congress had begun or if the break was still on. It was so noisy in the hall that the chairman's chief task was to call for quiet and for people to be present in the hall.... In short, it was the general opinion that Solidarity's wisest action was not to allow television to broadcast from the hall for if the organizational helplessness and exemplary indiscipline had been shown, all Solidarity members would have been consumed with shame and disgrace all week.... Nor can I number among the achievements of the congress the fact that not one of its 30 decisions, with the exception of the decision on worker self-management, concerns the workers and their problems or relates to the working class. For me, it was a political congress, not a trade union congress, a congress at which 80 percent of the delegates were Solidarity staff members."

No, not only speeches like those cited above were heard in the Oliwia hall, Overt threats to authority and demands to make way for private capital were heard there, and everything that People's Poland has achieved was mixed with dirt. Those who wanted to voice the workers' true opinion were unceremoniously silenced there. In this respect the speech by the representative from Lublin was significant. "We people at the bottom," he said, "can see clearly that the authorities of our trade union association are obsessed with scribbling, and we are losing our common language...."

"Forgive me," the chairman interrupted him, "but this has nothing to do with socio-economic problems."

The speaker was somewhat taken aback, but then continued. But the chairman intervened once again: "You are still not keeping to the point," "Please don't say that," the speaker grew heated. "I have been trying to speak for 6 days. The plant collective charged me with expressing its opinion. I cannot speak as elegantly as the others for I am a simple worker, but I want to say what pains my soul...."

But they did not let him speak and drove him from the rostrum. That was how Solidarity's leaders acted.

The illuminated display board in the Oliwia hall, which usually reports who rammed the puck home and in what minute, constantly flashed up appeals to observe order, to stop walking about and not to leave the hall. I believe that such chaos suited the Solidarity leadership perfectly. In that din and confusion it was easier to force through an antipopular program designed for the seizure of power. In that chaos many of those participating in the "congress" could not follow which of the countless proposals was being discussed or just what was being voted on. It was not for nothing that one of the Silesian representatives, as the BULLETIN FAKTY reported, declared: "We voted many hundreds of times. For what? It is hard for me to answer. My excuse is the fact that the chairman himself got lost once and said: 'Excuse me, but I don't know what we have just voted for.'"

Solidarity's leaders succeeded in provoking a 1-hour strike on 28 October. They are trying to move into a new offensive, making increasingly absurd demands. Analyzing the situation that has been created, I recalled the first postwar years. A huge, formless foundation pit gaped almost in the center of Warsaw, and huge mounds of broken bricks towered up. This was all that remained of the once magnificent royal castle. It was not simply a palace, but the Poles' national pride. The fascists were well aware of that. They attacked it with guns and dropped hundreds upon hundreds of heavy bombs, but the palace remained standing. They they captured it. And when they realized that they had to get out of Warsaw, they drilled 11,000 holes in the palace walls and laid explosives. There were 11,000 simultaneous explosions which merged into one.

The royal castle, reborn in People's Poland, now stands in Warsaw in all its original glory. Convinced that the "bombing" of the people's system will not result in its downfall, even though it is causing great damage, Solidarity's leaders have now begun, fascist-style, to drill holes in the living body of People's Poland. And many people have seen this.

The masses of Poland's working people, including Solidarity's rank-and-file members, have increasingly begun to realize the true aims of its leaders. Voices are saying increasingly frequently: "This is not the organization I joined." "I am leaving this organization which struggles not for the workers' interests, but for something else." "What has Solidarity given us over the past year? Just new suffering", and so forth.

If the words cited above were heard at this so-called congress at which mostly Solidarity staff members gathered, you can understand how much displeasure it arouses in those who are forcibly made to strike. Although it cannot be said that a fundamental change has occurred in people's consciousness for Solidarity's leaders are still managing to mislead many people by playing on the economic difficulties and exacerbating them in every possible way, a number of encouraging signs have appeared.

After a long break many people have once again reached out to the party with their souls. Most recently people have been joining the PZPR in all the voivodships, albeit not in masses.

I talked with two of them -- J. Draganski, a technological engineer at a Gdansk shipyard, and Z. Klinbergerg, a highly skilled ship painter. I said that the party, as they know, is being subjected to monstrous attacks by Solidarity and is in a serious position. Why have they decided to join the party right now?

"But you have already answered that question," J. Draganski said. "We are joining precisely to help the workers party at a difficult time for it. Today it is far from just a few who think this and do likewise -- an important factor.

I have spoken with many Poles of all social strata, with people loyal to the people's system, with doubters and with its open enemies. I understand that the country is in a profound crisis. However, I believe -- I want to believe -- that commonsense will ultimately triumph. Political adventurers must not and cannot gain the upper hand over the people.

The PZPR Central Committee's Fifth Plenum and the recent Polish Sejm session declared that the period of calls for good sense, of persuasion and warning cannot continue indefinitely. The cup of patience is overflowing. The limit of indulgence and of all-forgiveness for the criminal actions of political adventurers and enemies of People's Poland has been exhausted. Let those who have made the undermining of the economy a tool in the struggle to overthrow the system know this.

HUNGARIAN PRESS RECALLS EVENTS OF 1956

PM191145 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 46, 13 Nov 81 pp 22-23

[Unattributed article: "Lessons of History on the Pages of the Foreign Press']

[Text] When reminding its readers about the events in Hungary 25 years ago, the bourgeois press is forced to acknowledge the Hungarian people's current achievements in socialist building. At the same time, remaining true to itself, it seeks to prove that it is practically the Hungarian counterrevolutionaries and their foreign inspirers who stand at the sources of these indisputable achievements of the Hungarian working people.

The political thrust of this lie is obvious. The Hungarian press worthily rebukes those who have set themselves the aim of distorting the truth about the events of the fall of 1956. The MSZMP organ NEPSZABADSAG has published an editorial article devoted to the events of 25 years ago. It points out that the real cause of those events was the serious errors in the policy of the former party leadership, the treachery of the revisionists and other negative features. These were exploited by hostile elements within the country and abroad. They decided that a suitable moment had come to block the process of the renewal of the party and society, the process of consolidation in the country -- a process which had begun under the beneficial influence of the 20th CPSU Congress decisions. The counterrevolutionaries set themselves the goal of liquidating the socialist system in Hungary.

NEPSZABADSAG points out that the struggle at that time was taking place in an exceptionally difficult situation. The decisive turning point in the course of events was 4 November when leaders true to the cause of socialism left the former government, which had virtually entered into an alliance with the counterrevolution, and formed the republic's new government. History confirmed that the new government formed by experienced and tested revolutionaries led by J. Kadar rightly called itself the Hungarian Revolutionary Worker and Peasant Government.

This was, the paper writes, a genuine Hungarian government because it centered its activity on concern for the sovereignty and independence of the nation. It combined the universal laws of socialist building with national features and with progressive traditions, taking account of its people's interests. This was a revolutionary government since it decisively and without delay joined battle with the counterrevolution, the white terror and the reactionary forces. This was a worker and peasant government. It relied boldly and with profound trust on the country's working class and peasantry, cooperated with the social organizations and created a militant workers militia to defend the workers' and peasants' power. This government chose persuasion as its main weapon, but it resolutely responded with weapons to the armed violence from the enemies of socialism by asking the USSR for military aid.

The article points out that the Hungarian revolutionary Worker and Peasant Government, having assumed enormous tasks in an extremely complex situation, fulfilled them with honor. The results of the last 25 years, which have brought the people genuine prosperity, are evidence of this.

The Hungarian people, NEPSZABADSAG stresses, who on 4 November gained the opportunity to once again set about building a socialist society, honor with great respect the memory of the Hungarian and Soviet people who paid with their lives for the events of 1956. The paper recalls that the country's people drew lessons from these events, and this lends them strength and confidence in advancing along the path outlined by the party. They have boundless trust in their party and government and look to the future with revolutionary optimism.

An article by J. Berecz, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and chief of the Central Committee's International Section, in one of the October issues of MAGYAR NEMZET, is also devoted to the events of October-November 1956. It is called "Hungary and International Politics." The author stresses that at that time the imperialist states were counting on exploiting all the possible consequences of the counterrevolution in Hungary in an attempt to undermine cooperation between the socialist countries and to weaken the world communist and workers movement theoretically and organizationally.

The author writes that the counterrevolutionary forces and the Hungarian revisionists made it their aim for the country to renounce the fraternal ties with the USSR, to leave the community of socialist countries and go over to the capitalist camp. But this was prevented by the powerful opposition of the revolutionary forces and the help of the Soviet Union. The article points out that the Soviet Union was and is for Hungary the guarantee of independence and an example in socialist building.

In the 6 years after the suppression of the counterrevolution, Hungary could not organize its ties with the developed capitalist countries. For a long time they did not want to accept the failure of the attempt to restore capitalism, and they waged a frantic slander campaign against the republic in an attempt to bring about the country's international isolation by including the notorious "Hungarian question" on the agenda of the UN General Assembly. They interfered in every possible way in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and UN member.

But the imperialists got nowhere with this either. Now Hungary is active in the international arena. It has diplomatic relations with 127 countries -- with virtually all countries of the world except for those where fascist and racist regimes are in power. Between 1970 and 1975 Hungary concluded 900 international agreements, and from 1975 to the present day -- over 250 more.

Hungary's foreign policy, the author of the MAGYAR NEMZET article points out, is consistently socialist in nature and aimed at cohesion with the fraternal countries. At the same time it is completely independent.

The criterion of Hungary's foreign policy, the article says, is not temporary considerations but principledness and realism, and the prime role in the international appraisal of Hungary's successes during the 25 years since the suppression of the counterrevolution is played by Hungary's political and economic successes, the strengthening of the socialist system in the country and its popularity among the masses.

These are the essential lessons of Hungarian history, the Hungarian press materials stress.

DPA SUPPLIES AGENDA FOR BREZHNEV FRG VISIT

LD191350 Hamburg DPA in German 1354 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Excerpt] Bonn, 19 Nov (DPA) -- During Leonid Brezhnev's visit to Bonn, which comes under the protocol heading of a "working visit," only an approximately 2-hour talk with the chancellor is planned for the time being. Schmidt will also meet Brezhnev on two other occasions -- at talks between the delegations and at a dinner. There will also be an opportunity to talk when Schmidt collects his guest from the airport on Sunday evening and accompanies him to Brezhnev's residence at Gymnich Castle, near Bonn, and when he sees him off at noon on Wednesday.

According to Bonn government circles, it is possible that during the visit the natural gas pipes deal -- about which the United States in particular has expressed strong reservations -- could be signed. Government sources describe the deal, which involves supplying approximately 40 billion cubic meters of natural gas from Siberia annually to West Europe, as an important sphere of economic cooperation which also serves to stabilize political relations. The Soviet Union will use the gas, of which approximately 12 billion cubic meters will be supplied annually to the Federal Republic, as payment for the supplies of pipes from Europe.

Brezhnev, whose program includes extensive rest periods because of his state of health, will be officially received with military honors at the Federal Chancellor's Office on Monday. Parallel to his private talk with Schmidt in the late afternoon there will be a meeting between Foreign Ministers Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Andrey Gromyko. On Tuesday morning Brezhnev will receive, for half an hour each, the chairmen of the four parties represented in the Bundestag: Genscher (FDP), Helmut Kohl (CDU), Franz Josef Strauss (CSU) and Willy Brandt (SPD). A meeting with Federal President Karl Carstens is planned for Tuesday afternoon.

Brezhnev, who was in Bonn in 1973 and 1978, will be accompanied by an official delegation of 14 people. The highest-ranking members of the delegation are, in addition to Gromyko, First Deputy Premier Ivan Arkhipov, Brezhnev advisers Aleksandrov and Blatov, and the head of the Central Committee's International Information Department, Leonid Zamyatin.

NOVOYE VREMYA REGRETS LEDDA PCI MEETING STATEMENT

WA191440 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 19 Nov 81

["A Strange Stand" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov (TASS) -- The Soviet weekly NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VREMYA] has expressed "surprise and regret" in connection with a report made by Romano Ledda at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the Italian Communist Party (PCI). The speaker who is heading the PCI Centre for International Policy Studies tried to lay the "responsibility for the present international crisis" not only on the USA but also on the Soviet Union.

"It is difficult to say what is more here: The lack of knowledge of elementary facts or a direct distortion of the true state of affairs," the NEW TIMES writes in its issue dated November 20. Negating the political initiative of Soviet foreign policy, "the Italian communist 'did not notice' the 25th Congress of the CPSU which advanced a programme to further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence of the peoples, a programme which was exactly the Soviet political reaction to the new world situation which originated in the middle of the seventies."

"Neither did Romano Ledda notice the 26th Congress of the CPSU at which our party put forward an extensive concrete programme for improving the international political climate. Officially the PCI leadership spoke highly of the foreign policy initiatives of both the 25th and 26th congresses of the CPSU!"

"If one takes a closer look at the conception set out by Romano Ledda," the NEW TIMES goes on, "one cannot but gather the impression: He apparently considers that all the outstanding trimumphs of the national liberation movement of recent years -- for example, in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Mozambique and other countries -- have been won not by the peoples of those countries backed up by the fraternal internationalist help of the states of the socialist community, but are the result of the pursuance by the Soviet Union of a 'policy of strength, of a policy of strengthening and broadening its own military-political bloc'. Strange logic, indeed!"

The weekly emphasises that the Soviet Union "has rendered and will render assistance to the peoples struggling for their freedom." "We have always considered that communist solidarity must be expressed not in verbal declarations and the less so in haughty critical remarks addressed to newborn revolutions, but in effectively protecting them from the export of counterrevolution."

Pointing out that Romano Ledda unfoundedly ascribes a "cautious" stand to the United States, the NEW TIMES writes: "If one analyses everything that was said by Romano Ledda, a question suggests itself: How can one effectively struggle against the growing war threat (the existence of this threat is recognized in the report as an obvious fact), if the causes of it are appraised in a wrong way? If the USSR and the USA are placed in point of fact on a [as received] level? If Moscow is blamed almost on a par with Washington for the arms race?"

"We do not call on the Italian comrades to pursue a bloc policy, of which the Soviet Union has been and remains a resolute opponent. We call on them only to jointly struggle against the war danger on the basis of an exact, class analysis of the complex and contradictory situation which has now developed in the international arena," the journal writes in conclusion.

TASS URGES FINNS TO FOLLOW KEKKONEN LINE

LD201016 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0600 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov (TASS) -- "All real friends of the Finnish people would like to believe that its choice will be a choice favoring the continuation of the cause of Kekkonen," Yuriy Kuznetsov writes in PRAVDA today.

In connection with the forthcoming presidential elections, the author notes that "on retiring from the presidency, U.K. Kekkonen is leaving the Finns a good legacy, stable, good neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, ensuring the security of the frontiers of Finland and the independence of its foreign policy attitudes, as well as a reliable cooperation which is noticeably lessening those difficulties which that country is meeting in the crisis-buffeted capitalist world. It is no accident that Kekkonen's line now enjoys the support of all progressive forces of Finland, of the overwhelming majority of the Finnish people. And it is no accident, evidently, that the Union of Industry of Finland, one of the country's leading business circles' organizations, considered it necessary in its statement in connection with the forthcoming presidential elections to call for support for those parties and those persons which, inter alia, 'are actively developing employment-promoting trade with our neighbor, the Soviet Union.'"

It should not be thought, Yuriy Kuznetsov continues, that there are many whom Kekkonen's line did not suit; their ranks have thinned out considerably over the past few years.

"But they exist, they have at their disposal quite a few possibilities of influencing people, and they enjoy active support from outside Finland's borders. They are doing, and will undoubtedly try to continue doing their business, regardless of the means."

In these conditions, the author writes, "the responsibility of those forces which have always supported Kekkonen and his foreign policy line are especially great. Any miscalculation in their approach to the question of in whose hands Kekkonen's political legacy will reside can have consequences difficult to foresee."

Recalling that the Center Party will be the last one to name its candidate, the author writes: "And it is quite natural that at present in Finland there is public interest in the question of how this problem will be handled by that party from whose ranks Kekkonen himself emerged, the Center Party. It can even be said that this party is taking probably the most responsible decision in its entire history."

BREZHNEV CONGRATULATES AUSTRIAN PRESIDENT

LD201128 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov, TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev has addressed a telegram to Federal President of the Republic of Austria Rudolf Kirchschlaeger. The telegram conveys cordial congratulations and best wishes to the federal president and the friendly Austrian people on the occasion of the national holiday of the Austrian Republic.

Following the policy charted by the state treaty and the law of permanent neutrality, the telegram says, the Austrian Republic is making a positive contribution to the cause of preserving peace and security in Europe. This policy has met and will invariably meet with understanding and support from the Soviet Union. "I am expressing confidence that the relations of goodneighbourliness and constructive cooperation which have taken shape between the USSR and Austria, will further invariably strengthen and widen for the benefit of the Soviet and Austrian peoples," says the telegram.

Rudolf Kirchschlaeger expressed sincere gratitude for the congratulations. He also expressed conviction that the excellent relations between the two countries along with the state treaty and Austria's permanent neutrality will further constitute a solid basis for successful cooperation between the peoples of the two countries.

U.S. POLICY PRO-ISRAEL; BRIGHT STAR 'RISKY GAME'

PM191707 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 5

[L. Koryavin article: "Dangerous Maneuvers"]

[Text] Official Washington has long been trying to present its Near East course as a pair of scales with equally weighted pans. In one pan is Israel, in the other -- the Arab states. The United States seeks to use this metaphor to emphasize the "justice" of its Near East policy and demonstrate the U.S. "balanced course" -- that is, its equal, unbiased attitude toward Israel and the Arab countries.

But this is only publicity, a bluff, a tactical maneuver on Washington's part. America's "Near East scales" are held not by blindfolded, impartial Themis but by a dashing Pentagon military man who watches vigilantly and observes attentively what is happening in that strategically important region. And in fact the scales are clearly tipped one way -- toward Israel.

Let us take the "Israeli scale-pan." It is filled to the brim with American arms and weighed down by Washington's financial bounty. In this connection it should be stressed that America's Near East policy was not formulated yesterday. It has its own strategy and firmly established concepts. And if, when the guard is changed at the White House, some changes are announced in Washington's Near East course, this will be only words. U.S. policy is unswervingly directed toward strengthening Israel militarily, a state which occupies openly aggressive positions.

U.S. aid to Israel is measured in impressive figures. In the last 4 years alone, as the Washington POST writes, that country, with its population of 3 million, has received aid to the tune of more than $11 billion from its patrons across the ocean. And that is only through official channels, not counting "bounty from American friends," as the newspaper writes. "Subsidies to Israel," the Washington POST stresses, "are one of the few sacrosanct, inviolable items in our budget. Our annual subsidy to Israel today totals more than $2 billion, equivalent to more than $3,500 per year for every Israeli family of five." The paradox is that these thousands of dollars do not go to ordinary Israeli military-industrial complex.

Thus Israel has been and remains the main bastion of American imperialism in the Near East. There can be no two opinions about this. Recently, despite the fact that the Americans dropped a "gift" in the form of AWACS planes into the "Arab scale-pan," Washington has resolutely opposed allowing the pans on the "Near East scales" to become equal. B. Gwertzman noted in the New York TIMES that after the decision on delivering AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia, President Reagan told Israel that the United States remains "entirely loyal to its commitment" to help Israel retain "its military and technical superiority" over the Arabs. National security adviser Richard Allen reaffirmed this idea of his boss's: "The United States will not allow Israel's quantitative military superiority to disappear." So there is your U.S. "balanced policy" in the Near East.... There is your "impartial scale" of the Camp David peacemaking....

The so-called "strategic cooperation" is now being widely publicized -- a concept defining U.S.-Israeli relations at the present stage. What does it mean? It emerged, as is known, during Israeli Prime Minister M. Begin's recent visit to Washington. The concept represents broad, almost unique military cooperation between the two countries. The American fleet will be able to use the Israeli port of Haifa without hindrance. Some 150 American warplanes will be deployed in the Negev Desert. Israel will use American spy satellites to collect information on Arab countries. To all this, of course, will be added the tremendous military assistance the United States will continue to give to Tel Aviv.

To sum up, it may be said that "strategic cooperation" will mean, in essence, that the Israeli Army will become a subunit of the U.S. Armed Forces, while Israeli territory will become a firing range for American weapons and a bridgehead for the U.S. military, directed against national liberation forces.

The dangers of such "military integration" are obvious. For decades the Near East has been in a state of extreme tension from the Israeli-Arab conflict. Now yet another, highly dangerous destabilizing factor is emerging there -- the American military presence. Its range is extensive: Military bases in Egypt and Israel, fleets in the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean, American subunits in Sinai, other bridgeheads for the Rapid Deployment Force [RDF].

In its militarist plans, reflecting American imperialism's global aims, Washington is not averse to making use of the "Arab scale-pan," too, filling it with weapons, but on condition that they be used only against national liberation forces in the Near East and Africa. With Camp David the United States began to gamble particularly on Egypt. Its strategic location where two continents meet and its potential human resources attracted intense attention from Pentagon strategists. As in the old colonial times, not only businessmen but the military surged through the doors into Egypt flung open by As-Sadat. Egypt began to feel the "suffocating embraces of its mighty ally," as the New York TIMES admitted, and some people began ironically calling Cairo, now full of Americans, "Washington on the Nile...."

Egypt today is reminiscent of a battlefield. American Phantoms fly above the Nile delta and the surrounding deserts. To the capital's military airport, Cairo West, transport planes bring arms from the United States and American military bases sited far beyond the bounds of the United States. The port of Alexandria is active, with American hardware and military personnel arriving there, too. The ancient Sphinx seems to have bowed its head to the ground because of the wailing of the jet-powered Phantoms flying above it....

The joint American-Egyptian military maneuvers taking place under the code name Bright Star began 14 November. As is known, as well as Egypt, the American military will also hold maneuvers on the territory of the Sudan, Somalia and Oman.

The scale of this military action should be pointed out first of all. Many thousands of soldiers and the latest military hardware, according to the Pentagon generals' plans, are to demonstrate America's military might and its combat readiness and ability to conduct active operations in the Near East. This is no longer a matter of training somewhere in North Carolina in conditions "approximating the Near East situation," but an on-the-spot reconnaissance, a transatlantic raid by the American military, or, to put it more simply, direct penetration of the Near East by the U.S. Armed Forces.

Now for the schedule. The Bright Star maneuvers will take place in several stages, and their considerable length (they last nearly till December) indicates that the American military intends to become established in Egypt "firmly and for a long time."

Bright Star -- and this most important -- indicates that the United States has embarked, in effect, on active military penetration of the Near and Middle East regions. The fleets plying the waters of the mediterranean and the Persian Gulf and the military units deployed at Al-Masirah and other military bases in the region are being joined by even larger contingents of U.S. troops, which are being deployed on the territory of a foreign state.

Tel Aviv did not want its guns to be silent while America's were booming. Bright Star and the buildup of the transatlantic patron's troops in the Near East have inspired it to new aggressive acts.

Israeli Defense Minister Sharon has openly begun threatening "armed actions" against Syria, Lebanon and the PLO. Israel has recently held its own military maneuvers, with the participation of all categories of troops.

The Pentagon's maneuvers cannot be seen in isolation from Washington's overall, global militarist strategy. They form part of the major plan for military penetration of the so-called "spheres of vital U.S. interests -- that is, regions which Washington arbitrarily intends to subject to its own diktat because of their important strategic location and the presence of huge, and also strategic, raw materials reserves. Thus American militarism's safety fuses are already stretching out toward the oil klondikes of the Near and Middle East. On the access routes the United States is creating military bridgeheads in the form of "base states" -- a role which it seeks to assign to Egypt, Israel and other states so as to be able to deploy large contingents of American formations there in the long term. As the Washington POST notes, all this will enable the RDF to move "over the horizon" to forward bases where stockpiles of arms, fuel and other strategic materials are already sited. "The U.S. soldier will only have to step onto foreign soil, he will not have to 'dig in.' Everything will be ready for him."

Against the background of this militarist intoxication, active attempts are being made to resuscitate the Camp David process, which is virtually in its death throes today -- and not only because of the killing of As-Sadat. As a pro-Israeli process and a perfidious game launched by American diplomacy in the Near East it has been resolutely condemned by the Arab states.

The fact that the "Israeli scale-pan" weighed too heavily in the Camp David process is clear to everyone. Broad circles of the Egyptian public also began to understand that when As-Sadat's "peace-making euphoria" was succeeded by a process of sobering up. Peace did not come to Egypt, but the tracks of American tanks began to cross Egypt's sands, and Phantom wings hovered over the Pyramids. Naturally, this American military incursion could not fail to run counter to the spirit of the Egyptians, who have long traditions and anticolonialist, anti-imperialist struggle and have not forgotten the effects of the prolonged British military domination of their territory.

American military penetration of the Near East is fraught with serious danger to the cause of the national liberation movement of Arab and other peoples. The United States, knocking together an alliance between Israel and reactionary forces in the Near East region and Africa, would like to strike a blow against the anti-imperialist forces and return these liberated regions to the times of colonial dependence on Western powers.

Crude pressure is now being brought to bear on Libya. It is openly threatened with military actions. Washington's direct encouragement for an incursion into Libya is, naturally, associated with the Bright Star maneuvers, during which not only Egyptian but American troops are being concentrated near Libya's borders.

Bright Star is a risky game by the American military in the Near East. The maneuvers are whipping up the atmosphere still further in this already explosive part of the world.

SYRIAN NEWSMAN CITED ON EGYPT AFTER AS-SADAT

PM191417 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 81 p 3

[A. Novikov interview with Muhammad Khayr al-Wadi, general director of the Syrian newspaper ATH-THAWRAH: "Around the Shots in Cairo" -- first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The international situation at the present stage is marked by special keeness and tension. One of our planet's "hot spots" remains the Near East. Today Muhammad Kahayr al-Wadi, general director of the Syrian newspaper ATH-THAWRAH, who took part in the recent Ninth International Organization of Journalists Congress in Moscow, answers KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's questions connected with the region's current problems.

[Question] There is much conjecture at the moment about what caused the recent events in Egypt. Some people believe that the assassination of President Anwar as-Sadat was carried out by a group of religious fanatics, others find a deeper explanation -- dissatisfaction with the government's policy. Where do you see the roots of what happened?

[Answer] It seems to me doubtful that the reasons which led to the murder of the Egyptian president should be sought in religious contradictions. Rather, it is appropriate to speak of the two global factors which, taken together, serve as the sole criterion for determining the nature of a particular statesman. I refer to domestic and foreign policy: repressions and a course toward degradation of the national economy within the country, and separatism and a policy of betraying the interests of the Arab nation in the foreign policy arena. That is what killed As-Sadat, and I am profoundly convinced that these reasons are inseparable.

He steered a course toward isolating Egypt from the socialist states, particularly the Soviet Union, and from the countries of the Arab world. He destroyed the united bloc of the Arab states and threw his country into the embraces of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States and Israel. This could not fail to affect his domestic policy. Persecutions of progressive forces began in the country, and all that was left of democracy was the name. The state sector in the economy was eliminated and national resources were handed over to the foreign monopolies to be plundered. The land which the July revolution had given to the peasants was taken from them and returned to its former owners -- that is, the land reform, one of the Arab people's most important achievements, was canceled out. In other words, As-Sadat nullified all the gains of the July revolution and the victories which the country had won under President an-Nasir's leadership.

[Question] Do you believe that the organizers of President as-Sadat's assassination succeeded in attaining the objectives they had set themselves?

[Answer] It is well known that acts of terrorism are no way to resolve problems; nonetheless, the president's death has had a considerable influence on the internal political situation in the country. First, the Egyptian people are exhilarated as never before. For them As-Sadat was, understandably, the embodiment of all the sufferings and tribulations they had experienced in recent years. The regime, which had become a tyranny, has not been abolished but it has been decapitated and for the people this itself was a moral stimulus. Second, the ruling circles have obviously realized that the Egyptian people are against the policy pursued by As-Sadat, and this will be a lesson to them.

[Question] You mean that the "open door" and Camp David policies died with As-Sadat?

[Answer] By no means. I am saying that the president's assassination should be a lesson to Egypt's new rulers. They must realize that the country can under no circumstances be governed via repression and that the Arab people do not forgive betrayal. Nonetheless, I have no illusions regarding rapid changes in Egypt's foreign policy. Yes, the assassination dealt a grave blow to the Camp David course, but so far has not changed it. Unfortunately, the present Egyptian leadership continues to assert its loyalty to its predecessor's policy.

One other factor -- a negative one generated by the shots in Cairo -- is the frenzied activation of U.S. military preparations in the Mediterranean region.

[Question] Since you have mentioned the United States, can we, in your view, expect sharp measures of resistance from Washington if radical changes in favor of the progressive forces take place in Egypt?

[Answer] The United States, without losing a minute, is already using the Egyptian events to build up its military presence. It wants to preserve its positions in that country. What else can explain the fact that the Rapid Deployment Force has been placed on increased combat alert, that ships of the U.S. Navy have been moved up to Egyptian shores, or that AWACS aircraft and special intelligence subunits have been dispatched to this region? The main task which the U.S. strategists are setting themselves for the near future is to prevent Egypt from deviating from the path initiated at Camp David. Indeed, even before As-Sadat's death CIA agents whose goal was to prevent popular upheavals in Egypt were operating in the country. To this end they used any means, right up to the kindling of internecine disputes on religious grounds.

As for the possible turn of events in relations between the United States and Egypt, here it is essential to consider a whole series of factors. The most important is the heightened aggressiveness of the U.S. administration, which has declared the whole world to be the "sphere of its vital interests." Nor should we forget the anti-Libyan campaign which the United States is pursuing or the fact that this is all taking place against the background of the "strategic alliance" concluded between Washington and Tel Aviv. Taking all this into account, I believe that anything can be expected from the United States now.

[Question] So you believe the United States may on some pretext actually embark on armed interference in Egypt's internal affairs?

[Answer] Reagan has absolutely no need of pretexts. He believes that a reference to the need to "defend U.S. interests" is quite adequate grounds for interfering in the internal affairs of any state in any region. Egypt will be no exception. On the contrary, considering that country's extraordinary importance from the strategic, political and geographical viewpoints, Washington will do everything to keep it in its sphere of influence. That is why I believe that armed intervention is not ruled out.

[Question] Is it appropriate to blame As-Sadat alone for the fact that the country has left the trail blazed by President an-Nasir, or has this been caused by external factors?

[Answer] In my view it is mainly Washington that is to blame for what has happened. It was hampered by the unity of the Arab countries -- a unity headed by Egypt -- and wanted to split that unity, in order subsequently to subjugate the Arab countries one by one. In indulging Israel, Washington sought to deprive the Palestinian people of the Arab countries' support and thereby put an end to them. The Camp David agreement -- that diabolical recipe cooked up in the White House kitchen -- emerged. As-Sadat became no more than a tool in Washington's hands.

[Question] One last question: What in your view now defines the situation in the countries of the Arab world?

[Answer] The main political trend in the Arab world today is the intensification of the Arab nation's cohesion in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and Zionism, an intensification taking place under the leadership of the National Steadfastness and Confrontation Front. And although we have not achieved much yet, I believe that in the very near future we shall witness great changes in the Near East.

KHAMENE'I SEES U.S. THREAT TO MIDDLE EAST, AFRICA

GF191558 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1300 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] 'Ali Hoseyni Khamene'i, the president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, meeting with Islamic ambassadors in Iran, said that the real threat to the security of area countries is the political and military presence of the United States. The president stressed that U.S. military and political presence surely will bring deprivations, misery and misfortune to the nations of Africa and the Middle East. Experience has proved that U.S. presence in any region of the world has always caused the plundering of the economies of the region's countries and the destruction of their national cultures. It has also caused the loss of political, economic and cultural independence. The increased tension in the Middle East and threat to world peace, for example, are the direct result of U.S. military presence in the Middle East.

'Ali Hoseyni Khamene'i added that the aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism and Zionism endangers the independence and sovereignty of the African and Middle Eastern nations. The United States and its allies in Tel Aviv are pursuing an explicit policy of interference to supress the freedom movement of the Arab nations. In this connection Khamene'i stressed that the Pentagon's Bright Star maneuvers carried out in the territories of Egypt, Sudan, Somalia and Oman endanger the security of all countries of the region, encourage the occupier regime of Israel that has occupied Arab lands and violate the rights of the Palestinian people.

SOVIET-LIBYAN COMMISSION ENDS WORK IN TRIPOLI

LD191806 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Tripoli -- The work of the seventh session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Libyan Commission on Development of Economic and Scientifical Cooperation and Trade has been completed. Those taking part considered measures for the further expansion and deepening of the relations between the two countries in various fields of the economy, science and technology. The sides signed a protocol on cooperation between Libya and the USSR.

U.S. STEPS UP ANTI-CUBAN 'PROVOCATIONS'

PM191611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Lapskiy article: "Weaving Plots: The United States is Stepping Up Provocative Machinations Against Cuba"]

[Excerpts] Sensations, which America's big press lives on, come in various varieties and have various goals. As well as the purely "commercial" ones, designed to strike the reader's imagination and test his nervous system, there are sensations of another kind -- political ones, professionally prepared lies with "convincing" details and references to authorities. In other words, sensations in form, provocations in content. An item which appeared recently in the Washington POST falls into this category.

It begins thus: "Cuban special-purpose troops, intended for making a rapid strike and numbering 500-600 men, have been airlifted to Nicaragua." The article, whose authors cite "absolutely reliable Latin American sources," goes on to describe how the Cuban soldiers, dressed "like ordinary tourists" and carrying suitcases containing weapons, climbed into waiting helicopters anf flew off toward the jungle, in the direction of El Salvador. Some time later a strategically important bridge over the Lempa River, which divides El Salvador in two, was blown up. The authors of the fabrications mistakenly recognized the "handwriting and professionalism of the Cubans" in this action by Salvadoran patriots, which was much written about in the world press. If the second and last bridge is blown up, they write, the Salvadoran Army will be unable to recover one-third of the country's territory. They warn that in that part of El Salvador "Cuban special-purpose forces are preparing to create a communist government."

What conclusion does the Washington POST propose to draw from this sinister report? This: that President R. Reagan's administration must "take an immediate decision" on Cuba and El Salvador. Specifically, that it must elaborate sanctions against Havana and grant additional material assistance to the Salvadoran junta, to include sending a new, bigger contingent of American "advisers" to that country....

The Washington administration has not, of course, answered the Cuban Government's request for proof that Cuba is interfering in other people's affairs. This silence amounts to a virtual admission that the Washington POST's accusations against Havana are false through and through and that most likely they appeared with the knowledge of the authorities.

We are faced with a typical provocation in the spirit of the psychological warfare now being waged against socialist Cuba by U.S. propaganda organs. Its aim is to fan anti-Cuban hysteria in the United States and elsewhere and to justify in advance the antiCuban actions which Washington is planning.

Washington is spinning a web of conspiracy around Cuba, organizing political and economic sabotage against it and whipping up tension around the island. This aim was served, in particular, by a secret conference of army commanders and intelligence personnel from the United States and a number of Latin American countries which ended in America's Fort McNair the other day. The conference participants were addressed by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger and J.G. Garcia, defense minister of the Salvadoran junta. After this meeting rumors emerged with new force that the United States is planning military actions against Cuba.

CIA secret operations against Cuba have become more active and dangerous. Saboteurs are being sent into the island to organize attacks on party and state leaders.

Biological sabotage has become more frequent. Of course, Washington denies its involvement, but who can believe in U.S. sincerity! In this connection it is interesting to note the admission of the authors of a book which appeared in New York recently with the title "The Fish Are Red." (That was the code phrase spoken by a CIA agent on the radio to give the signal for the start of the Playa Giron intervention in 1961.) Noting that the United States has recently significantly stepped up its provocative anti-Cuban intrigues, they write: "The facts indicate that the United States is again waging biological warfare against Cuba. Thus, immediately after the epidemic of dengue fever, from which 156 people died, an outbreak of hemorrhagic conjunctivitis was recorded on the island. It is known that these diseases were imported to the island and that the dengue fever virus, in particular, is the subject of particular attention in U.S. research centers engaged in developing biological weapons."

Cuba is building socialism in the conditions of continuing imperialist provocations and threats. This requires a great intensity of effort from the country. However, the Washington administration is mistaken if it thinks it can intimidate the Cuban people with blackmail and flagrant attacks. These calculations are hollow. "We will stand firm," the Havana newspaper GRANMA wrote recently. "We have proved more than once that the imperialists cannot inspire fear in us."

The campaign launched by Washington, Comrade Fidel Castro stated the other day, "has exposed the essential falsity of American imperialists who have tried to slander Cuba."

The organizers of anti-Cuban provocations should be clearly aware of the dangerous consequences of their actions. Cuba is a member of the socialist community. It enjoys high, well-earned international prestige. Since the victory of the revolution the Cuban people have never felt alone. Now, too, in the difficult conditions of confrontation with imperialism, their true friends and likeminded people are by their side.

TRUD INTERVIEWS CUBA'S VEIGA ON U.S. HOSTILITY

PM191507 Moscow TRUD in Russian 13 Nov 81 p 3

[Correspondent N. Shevtsov interview with Roberto Veiga, secretary general of the Central Union of Cuban Workers: "Determination Born in Struggle" -- first paragraph is TRUD introduction, date and place of interview not given]

[Text] Roberto Veiga, candidate member of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee Politburo and secretary general of the Central Union of Cuban Workers [CTC], answers the questions of TRUD correspondent N. Shevtsov.

[Question] What tasks now face the CTC:

[Answer] Our tasks cannot be separated from the main international problems perturbing all mankind. The Reagan administration's adventurist aggressive policy threatens the security of many countries of the world, including Cuba. Cuba's example and its friendship with the USSR and the other socialist community countries, its solidarity with all peoples struggling for peace, democracy and social progress inspire Washington's unconcealed hatred. That is why one of the Cuban trade unions' main tasks is to prepare the working people to rebuff potential imperialist aggression at any moment. We are helping the military training of our trade union members and the enhancement of their class consciousness so that they can deal a resolute rebuff to any attack.

At the same time, the struggle to strengthen our country's defense potential is based on developing its economy. Thus there is special significance in attaining greater efficiency in all our production and in the service and education spheres.

This is one more task facing the Cuban trade unions. We produce for defense and work for victory. The watchword "production and defense" is resolutely supported by the entire people. It is being successfully implemented in practice.

The Cuban trade unions are working enthusiastically, doing much to implement the working people's rights granted by the revolution.

[Question] How are the Cuban working people and the country's trade unions preparing for the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions, which, as is well known, will take place in Havana next February?

[Answer] The Cuban people welcomed with great enthusiasm the news that the 10th World Congress of Trade Unions will be held in our country's capital. The working people of various enterprises have assumed specific production of pledges for this event. Socialist competition devoted to the congress is developing successfully. To mark the forthcoming forum, a nationwide working Sunday will be held in our country, in which almost 2 million Cuban working people will take part.

Every condition has now been created for holding the congress. It will take place in our capital's Palace of Congresses, which in recent years has frequently been the venue for major national and international meetings. I can assure you that a warm and cordial reception awaits the congress participants in our country.

[Question] How do you assess the prospects for the development of cooperation between the Soviet and Cuban trade unions?

[Answer] Our cooperation has always been broad and diverse, and that is perfectly natural since it accords with the firm and indestructible ties uniting our working people and their communist parties. I think our delegation's visit to the USSR and the signing of the document on further developing cooperation between the Soviet and Cuban trade unions will be a new step on the path of consolidating our friendship.

[Question] The United States has recently galvanized its hostile policy vis-a-vis Cuba. What are its specific manifestations?

[Answer] The intensification of aggressive actions against Cuba stems from the overall policy inherent in U.S. imperialism and pursued in practice by the Reagan administration. The economic blockade against our country has been intensified, and subversive espionage activity by the U.S. special services has been galvanized. Using its propaganda apparatus, the United States is stepping up its slander campaign against Cuba. The U.S. administration recently decided to open a new radio station, with broadcasts designed especially for Cuba. Their aim is to destabilize the political situation in our country. The CIA now operates without restrictions from the U.S. administration on its intelligence activity against Cuba.

However, hostile actions by the United States cannot intimidate the Cuban people; they merely strengthen their determination and faith and confidence in our ultimate victory.

Biological warfare has been unleashed against our country. In recent years Cuba has suffered several epidemics. Livestock and agricultural plants have been stricken. The last "dengue fever" epidemic killed 156 people, 100 of them children. It could have led to graver consequences had it not been halted thanks to prompt and vigorous steps by our party, government, doctors and medical personnel. And, of course, mention must be made of the aid given to us by the Soviet Union in combating the epidemic.

IZVESTIYA PUBLISHES MORE ANNIVERSARY MESSAGES

Iranian President

PM181203 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] To his excellency, Mr Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

I congratulate you and the peoples of the Soviet republics on the anniversary of the victory of the October Revolution. I express the hope that all people's revolutions and the struggle against the desire for dominion will embrace the whole world and will help oppressed peoples in their struggle for liberation.

I am sure that only by liberating the peoples of the world and granting them independence can peace and justice be established and prerequisites created for mankind's prosperity,

[Signed] Seyyed 'Ali Hoseyni-Khamene'i, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Saddam Husayn

PM191001 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] To Mr Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Mr Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers:

On the occasion of the 64th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, I send congratulations to you and to the peoples of the friendly Soviet Union on behalf of Iraq and on my own account.

We are sure that the relations of friendship and cooperation which exist between our countries, relations based on full equality and mutual respect for the will of our peoples, will enjoy further development in accordance with the principles of the treaty of friendship and cooperation concluded between Iraq and the Soviet Union.

Iraq favors the development of these relations. We assess with great optimism the prospects for strengthening the bonds of Iraq-Soviet friendship for the good of our countries' peoples, in the interests of the struggle against the intrigues of imperialism and Zionism and all forms of aggression against peoples and for the sake of the freedom and well-being of mankind.

I wish the friendly Soviet Union further progress.

[Signed] Saddam Husayn, chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council and president of the Iraqi Republic.

President of Sudan

PM191637 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 81 Morning Edition p 4

[Text] To His Excellency Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

On the occasion of your national holiday, I send my congratulations and best wishes for prosperity to you personally and to your friendly people.

[Signed] Ja'far Muhammad Numayri, president of the Democratic Republic of Sudan.

SUPREME SOVIET ADOPTS PLAN, SESSION ENDS

Session Proceedings

LD191640 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Excerpt] A joint meeting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities was held at today's USSR Supreme Soviet session. Those assembled welcomed with stormy prolonged applause Comrades Brezhnev, Andropov, Gorbachev, Gromyko, Kirilenko, Kunayev, Pelshe, Romanov, Suslov, Tikhonov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Shcherbitskiy, Aliyev, Demichev, Kisilev, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Rashidov, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Kapitonov, Dolgikh, Zimyanin and Rusakov.

Our special correspondents report on the final meeting of the session:

The deputies gathered for their joint meeting to sum up the results of the debates on the economic and social program of our country for the 5-year plan period and for next year. Much intensive work has taken place in the Kremlin in the past 3 days. Forty-seven deputies of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities spoke in the debate. Drafts of the state plans and budgets, taking into account all proposals, remarks and amendments made by the deputies, were put forward for their approval. The deputies voted separately in chambers. They unanimously adopted the USSR bill on the State Economic and Social Development Plan for 1981-85, the USSR bill on the State Plan for 1982, and also the USSR bill on the country's State Budget for the Second Year of the 5-Year Plan. Decisions were adopted on the progress of the fulfillment of the plan in 1981, and on the execution of the 1980 budget.

Georgadze, secretary of the Presidium, delivered a report on the decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The deputies unanimously approved these decrees. At that point the session concluded its work.

Economic, Social Issues Viewed

LD172210 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Nov 81

[Text] The deputies have begun discussing the reports on the plans for our country's economic and social development for the 11th 5-Year Plan period and for 1982. They are also discussing the USSR budget for the coming year.

Deputy Orlov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Lyashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers; Dementyeva, second secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Aksenov, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers; Vasilyev, USSR minister of land reclamation and water resources; Deputy Shibayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, and others participated in the debate.

The speakers noted the great significance of the 1981 November plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and of the speech made at the plenum by Comrade Brezhnev.

5-Year Plan Adopted

LD191424 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov, TASS -- The USSR Supreme Soviet, in the third day of its work in the Moscow Kremlin, today adopted the State Plan of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985. The country's new five-year plan has become law.

The plan provides for an increase in 1985 compared with 1980 of the national income by 18 percent, industrial output by 26 percent, labour productivity by 23 percent. The average annual agricultural output is to grow by 13 percent compared with the previous five-year period.

The plan contains an extensive programme of raising the well-being of the Soviet people. Real per capita incomes in the Soviet Union will grow by 16.5 percent in the five years.

Supreme Soviet Ends Session

LD191524 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov, TASS -- The three-day session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ended in the Kremlin. Taking part in its meetings were Leonid Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders.

The deputies heard a report on the State Plan of Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and on the plan for 1982, made by Vice-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Chairman of the State Planning Committee Nikolay Baybakov and a report on the State Budget of the USSR for 1982, made by Finance Minister Vasiliy Garbuzov.

The reports were debated at separate meetings of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities -- the two chambers of the Soviet parliament, which enjoy equal rights. Some 50 deputies spoke in the debates.

At a joint meeting of the two chambers on November 19, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR unanimously passed a law on the State Plan of Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985. Also adopted were laws on the State Plan of the USSR for 1982 and on the State Budget of the USSR for 1982. The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted resolutions on the course of the fulfilment of the 1981 plan and of the 1980 budget.

The USSR Supreme Soviet confirmed the decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, issued in the period between its previous and present sessions.

COMPARISON OF BREZHNEV CENTRAL COMMITTEE SPEECH

A comparison of the item entitled "CPSU Central Committee Plenum Opens 16 Nov" and subtitled "Brezhnev Speech," which appeared on pages R 1-R 10 of the 17 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, with the unattributed report published on pages 1-2 of Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 17 November reveals the following variations:

Page R 5, paragraph 6, line 2, PRAVDA reads: ...republican, oblast and city party organizations, all economic organs and scientific institutions, the...

Page R 9, paragraph 5, line 2, PRAVDA reads: ...resources, to curb thriftlessness and extravagance, speedily and drastically,...

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ON CADRE RESERVE PROBLEMS

PM191143 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 81 p 1

[Editorial: "Reserve of Cadres"]

[Excerpts] Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said from the rostrum at the 26th CPSU Congress: "The creation of a reliable reserve of cadres has been, and still is, an important task." As was pointed out at the congress, from this viewpoint great significance was attached to the restructuring of the work of higher party schools and educational institutions training cadres to manage the national economy and, in particular, to the creation of a qualitatively new academy of social sciences and academy of the national economy. Over the years that have elapsed 32,000 people have graduated from party educational institutions. More than 240,000 party, soviet and ideological workers have received instruction in courses.

Many party organizations have accumulated valuable experience of work with the reserve. A good system has evolved in this matter in the Ukraine, for example. Party committees in Dnepropetrovskaya, Donetskaya, Kharkovskaya and a number of other oblasts select two or three people for each post. The reserve is replenished as workers are promoted and is reviewed, as a rule, once a year.

Unfortunately, it frequently happens that, when it is necessary to replace a particular worker, it takes a long time to find a suitable candidate. What does this indicate? Above all, of course, the unconsidered preparation of the reserve.

Sometimes the first person to come along is promoted to take the place of a worker who has failed to cope with his work -- without proper comprehensive preparation. Naturally, this does not produce good results. This is precisely how "cadre leapfrogging" comes about -- which seriously harms the cause.

A recent Belorussian CP Central Committee plenum discussed the question of measures to improve the selection, placing and training of kolkhoz and sovkhoz leading cadres in light of the demands of the 26th CPSU Congress. The rich experience of the republic's party organizations in this important direction of work was revealed. But shortcomings were also spoken of. In Kostyukovichskiy Rayon, for example, 18 out of 21 farm leaders were replaced during the 5-year plan, and 1 in 5 had held that post for less than 3 years. And Korovskaya Oblast's Shavarzhakovskiy Kolkhoz has had five different chairmen over the past 5 years. Is it any wonder that the farm is falling further and further behind? There is a high turnover of kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders in Belgorodskaya and Vologodskaya Oblasts and in the Chuvashskaya ASSR.

People in some places treat the creation of a reserve formally and reduce virtually the whole business to compiling lists. Of course, such an approach is of little use. What we get is a so-called "paper" reserve, which has and can have no real significance.

Attention should also be drawn to this aspect of the matter. To begin with, a newly promoted worker needs real assistance and support. For it is no accident that leaders are most frequently released from their post in the first 2-3 years of their work. This is the result not only of mistakes in promotion but also of lack of attention shown to young cadres.

In accordance with the demands of the 26th CPSU Congress more concern must be shown for the participation of women in leading work. Still far from full use is being made of the opportunities for promoting them to responsible posts, and this situation must be rectified.

The art of working with the reserve of cadres is to study every person earnestly, to develop his strong points and help him get rid of his shortcomings, to teach him comprehensively beforehand and to prepare him for his new post. Comrades being promoted to a leading post must, without fail, be cooked up in the midst of the masses, as the saying goes. All communists who are considered to be in the reserve for promotion must pass through the school of life, the school of thorough practical work among the masses.

PRAVDA VIEWS FUTURE OF CLASSLESS SOCIETY

PM201001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 81 p 2

["Indestructible Alliance of Builders of Communism," article by Prof Sh. Munchayev, doctor of historical sciences, under the rubric "The 26th CPSU Congress -- Marxism-Leninism in Action"]

[Text] V.I. Lenin called the alliance of the laboring classes, which came about in our country with the October victory, the be-all and end-all of Soviet power. This alliance, Vladimir Ilich wrote, is a guarantee that the cause of society's revolutionary transformation will be carried through to a victorious end. Lenin viewed the transition to the higher phase of communism from the positions of the expansion and consolidation of the new system's social base.

The mature socialism built in the USSR has literally plowed over the strata of the people's life. In the process of its creation, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted, "the alliance of the working class and kolkhoz peasantry has been developed in the firm political and ideological unity of these classes with the people's intelligentsia which now stands wholly and fully on positions of socialism. The indestructible alliance which has now taken shape in the USSR among workers, peasants and intelligentsia and all workers employed in physical and mental labor is a very important source and guarantee of the further successes of communist building."

The 26th CPSU Congress noted that at the stage of mature socialism the rapprochment of all classes and social groups of Soviet society is continuing and their alliance is strengthening. Our goal is the creation of a society in which there will be no division of people into classes. It may definitely be said that we are gradually but confidently advancing to this great goal.

What gave the congress grounds for drawing this conclusion? The point is that mature socialism ensures a firm foundation for the development and improvement of the collectivist relations of the builders of communism and the raising of their social activeness. Now that society's demand for the all-round cooperation and coordination of action of all classes, strata and groups is being manifested increasingly fully, the objective and subjective opportunities for realizing this demand have been expanded. In the course of the further rapprochement of the two different forms of socialist ownership, and the gradual obliteration of the substantial differences between city and countryside and between mental and physical labor and as a result of all working people's transition to the ideological-political positions of the working classes, the real interests and goals and social ideals and mentality of all strata of the population have grown unprecedently close in our society. The result has been the firm establishment of a new historical community of people -- the unified Soviet people. This great community in turn exerts beneficial influence on the development of the alliance of builders of communism and within its framework class distinctions are intensively obliterated.

There is no doubt that the leading role in these processes belongs to the working class. As the most progressive class of our society, possessed of a high degree of ideological and political maturity and organization, it leads the peasantry both ideologically and politically and economically through the kolkhoz form of organizing farming. The sphere of its activity is being expanded in agricultural production which is increasingly becoming part of the agroindustrial complex unified on the scale of the entire country.

The countryside now can no longer be called unreservedly a countryside of peasants: A large part of its population consists of workers, employees and intelligentsia. Indeed, agricultural labor itself is gradually but steadily becoming a form of industrial labor, for the agricultural worker has to deal with complex machinery, electricity, chemistry, agrotechnics and animal science. Agriculture receives almost 3 times more motor vehicles each year than it did 15 years ago and the total power of the tractors delivered to the countryside over this time has more than doubled.

The growth of agriculture's technical equipment is producing not only a production benefit but an economic one too, promoting this sector's transition to an intensive development footing. It is revealing increasingly its profound social content, exerting a powerful influence on the development of the peasantry as a class and the improvement of its cultural and technical standard. On this basis a further rapprochement of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia is taking place, their alliance is developing, and society's social homogeneity is intensifying. That is why the course toward agriculture's transformation into an industrial sector of the economy was further developed in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The consolidation of the alliance of builders of communism is also being comprehensively promoted by the system of measures strengthening equitable, equivalent relations between city and countryside and industry and agriculture. Among these measures we should highlight in particular the establishment of firm plans for purchases of agricultural produce, the introduction of justifiably commensurate prices for this produce and for industrial goods for the countryside. There is no doubt that such acts help the even greater rapprochement of the kolkhoz peasantry and the working class and the development of their mutual ties.

The implementation of the CPSU's present-day agrarian policy has become one of the main factors of the further consolidation of the indestructible alliance of all classes and groups of socialist society. Workers, peasants, and people employed in mental labor are all equally interested in the effective development of agriculture. Here the interests of all classes and social groups are interwoven, which makes the task of further boosting this vitally important economic sector truly a task for all the people.

The joint labor of the builders of communism and the cohesive struggle for the solution of this task are cementing their great alliance still more strongly.

With a view to the population's uninterrupted provision with foodstuffs the 26th party congress deemed it essential to elaborate a special food program. A scientifically substantiated program of this kind is extraordinarily important economically and socially. It is designed to bring agriculture closer to the sectors engaging in the storage and processing of its produce and with trade. This will intensify the organic links between all parts of the single national economic complex and will strengthen the material foundations of the further rapprochement of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and intelligentsia and the cohesion of our entire people.

V.I. Lenin predicted that as the socialist method of production strengthens and the country's economic and scientific and technical potential is built up, the preconditions will arise for "the union of industry and arable farming on the basis of the conscious application of science and the combination of collective labor..." (In Complete Collected Works," Vol 26 p 74). He considered the task of socialism to be "to bring together and unite industry and farming" (Vol 42, p 15). In creatively resolving this task the party has defined the most effective ways of intensifying integration processes in agriculture. Large-scale concentration, specialization and interfarm agroindustrial cooperation are becoming the main avenues of these processes. The close collaboration of various economic sectors on the basis of the country's unified national economic complex is steadily leading to the acceleration of the processes of the rapprochement of the city and countryside and the merging of the two forms of socialist ownership -- the state and kolkhoz-cooperative forms. That is of enormous political and social significance since it promotes the kolkhoz peasantry's further rapprochement with the working class and the development of their relations and friendship.

In its agrarian policy the party proceeds from the premise that the boosting of agriculture is a matter for all the people. Of course, the rural workers make the decisive contribution to the development of this economic sector of such importance. But with every passing year the concern of all working people, of the entire people, for agriculture is increasing. This concern is also manifested in the city's aid to the countryside in terms of cadres, and in the training of specialists for kolkhozes and sovkhozes in educational establishments and at major industrial enterprises.

Among the effective means helping to strengthen the alliance of builders of communism, increasing significance, under present conditions, attaches to the city's patronage of the countryside. This is one of the revolutionary traditions of the working class which has now been comprehensively developed. Assistance in the form of patronage is now also provided for in the plans and socialist pledges of industrial enterprises and scientific research institutes, institutions and theaters. It covers not only the solution of problems connected with, for instance, the processes of mechanization, land reclamation, the creation of irrigation systems, the compilation of technical documents and the installation of new equipment, but is also being manifested increasingly now in the cultural services for the countryside. Through the efforts of patrons and with their aid, lectures are read, concerts are held and trips to theaters and museums are organized at kolkhozes and sovkhozes. For instance, here is what the chairman of the Semilukskiy Kolkhoz had to say: "A long line of buses frequently stops outside the building of the Voronezh theater of opera and ballet. Many Voronezh inhabitants know that the machine operators, stockraisers and fieldworkers from our kolkhoz have come to the theater. One day over 1,000 kolkhoz members heard A.P. Borodin's opera 'Prince Igor....'" With the present level of the countryside's cultural services, the creative collectives' contacts with its workers are strengthening.

The working class's leading role is growing as its cultural and technical standard improves and as its labor is intellectualized in the course of scientific and technical progress. Indicative in this respect is the participation of leading workers in the development of science and scientific services: In the early seventies they numbered 1 million, comprising almost one-third of those employed in this field.

The rapid tempo at which the workers' educational standard is being improved (three-fourths now have higher and secondary -- complete and incomplete - education) reflects an important aspect of their rapprochement with the intelligentsia. As we approach communism, the link between physical and mental labor becomes more organic. Already the worker frequently controls large-scale, intricate complexes of equipment with which not every engineer could have coped previously.

The greater the number of common features that appear in the socioeconomic situation and political and spiritual complexion of workers, peasants and intelligentsia, so the more fully their interests, goals and aspirations coincide and the stronger their alliance and friendship becomes under the conditions of developed socialism, when the political organization of society has become nationwide, and this strengthening alliance of the builders of communism is building up its creative force. It is precisely the joint labor of workers, kolkhoz members and intelligentsia, the Basic Guidelines say, which creates material and spiritual values and augments the country's national wealth. Depending on the organization and success of this joint labor, the power of the socialist motherland strengthens, personal and social requirements are satisfied more fully, and Soviet people's living standard becomes higher. The effective solution of any national economic or social problem under present-day conditions is ensured on the basis of the close alliance and common interest of all classes and social strata of our society.

The expansion of the alliance of the working class and peasantry to the scale of an alliance of all workers of physical and mental labor is a great gain of socialism. Their increasing rapprochement and cohesion around the party are a reliable way of further strengthening the unity of the entire Soviet people and are a guarantee of the successful implementation of the plans outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress.

NOVYY MIR PUBLISHES BREZHNEV 'REMINISCENCES'

PM130955 [Editorial Report] Moscow NOVYY MIR in Russian, Signed to Press on 21 October, publishes on pages 3-26 the text of the "Reminiscences" of L.I. Brezhnev. The section subtitled "Life with the Factory Whistle" ("Zhizn po Zavodskomy Gudku"), is an 8,000-word account of Brezhnev's early life in Kamenskoye (now Dneprodzerzhinsk) up to the time when he began work at the same plant as his father. The section subtitled "An Awareness of the Motherland" ("Chuvstvo Rodiny"), comprises episodes relating to Brezhnev's work in the agricultural sphere in the Kursk area, his return to Dneprodzerzhinsk where he joined the party, his being drafted into the army, and his work as deputy chairman of the Dneprodzerzhinsk Gorispolkom and later as Dneprodzerzhinskiy Obkom secretary for propaganda. The Brezhnev "Reminiscences" are also published in Moscow NEDELYA No 45, 2-8 November on pages 3-9.

ZIMYANIN ATTENDS SOIREE COMMEMORATING WRITER

PM191129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 81 p 2

[TASS report: "Devoted to a Writer and Fighter"]

[Text] A festive soiree held 11 November in the Red Banner Hall of the Soviet Army Central House in Moscow was devoted to the 90th anniversary of the birth of the writer and communist Dmitriy Furmanov, commissar of the legendary Chapayev Division.

The soiree was attended by M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; CPSU Central Committee section chiefs Ye. M. Tyazhelnikov and V.F. Shauro; and writers, Soviet Army servicemen, guests from the writer's native Ivanovskaya Oblast and representatives of the public.

The soiree ended with a concert by masters of arts.

OBITUARY OF MARXISM-LENINISM PROF A.I. SOBOLEV

PM191601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 81 p 6

[Obituary: "To the Memory of a Comrade"]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a serious loss. Prof Aleksandr Ivanovich Sobolev, CPSU member since 1939, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism's Department of the History of the International Communist Movement, chief editor of the journal RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR and doctor of philosophical sciences, died suddenly. He was a major specialist in the theory and history of the international communist and workers movement and the theory of sciencitif communism

A.I. Sobolev was born in 1915 into a peasant family in the village of Glubokoye in Suvorovskiy Rayon, Tulskaya Oblast.

[signed] A group of comrades

ROMANOV PRESENTS USSR AWARDS TO LENINGRADERS

PM161005 [Editorial Report] Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 5 November publishes on page one an 800-word LENTASS report entitled "For Labor Valor" which noted that "G.V. Romanov, member of the Politburo of that CPSU Central Committee and of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Leningradskiy Obkom, presented the motherland's high awards to a group of Leningraders at the Smolnyy Institute" on 4 November for their work during the 10th 5-Year Plan peiod.

Prizewinners Congratulated

PM161223 Leningrad LENINGRADKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 81 p 1

[LENTASS report: "Congratulations to Prizewinners"]

[Excerpts] On the eve of the 64th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution the ranks of USSR state prize winners have been swelled by a new detachment of scientists, engineers, socialist competition pace-setters and literary and artistic figures. They include quite a few Leningraders.

G.V. Romanov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningradskiy Obkom, cordially congratulated Leningrad's 1981 USSR state prize winners on the award of the lofty title and on the Great October holiday and wished them new successes in their work to fulfill the 26th CPSU Congress' historic decisions, good health and happiness.

AZERBAIJAN RAYKOM LEADER FIRED FOR ABUSES

PM171601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 81 p 2

[Correspondent L. Tairov report: "Punished According to His Deserts"]

[Text] Baku, 12 Nov -- The Azerbaijan CP Central Committee has released R. Alekperov from the post of first secretary of Udzharskiy Raykom for gross violations of the norms of party life, personal immodesty and abuse of his official position. He had embarked on a path of crude undemocratic administration, the substitution of soviet and economic organs and the unjustified replacement of cadres.

The Azerbaijan CP Central Committee pointed out that during the time of Alekperov's work in the Central Committee's party organizational work section no in-depth study of his business and moral qualities was made there. The attention of the members of the Udzharskiy Raykom Bureau was drawn to his unscrupulousness and the absence of collective decisionmaking in their work. The Azerbaijan CP Central Committee demanded that party organizations put an end to any attempt to suppress criticism.

KIRGIZ PROSECUTOR ACCUSED OF DELAYING INQUIRY

PM161219 [Editorial Report] Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian on 5 November publishes on page 3, under the rubric "The Law is Binding on Everyone," a 600-word unattributed article entitled "Query to the Republic's Prosecutor" which refers to a case of corruption and embezzlement in the republic, claiming that the investigation of the case has been "unjustifiably dragged out." It asserts that "the delay has been caused not by some particular complexity of the 'case,' but chiefly by the fact that the republic prosecutor's office has approached it without a due sense of responsibility and principle" and that the case has become enmeshed in "red tape." "As a result, the time allowed by procedural norms for the examination of such 'cases' has expired" and the accused persons are now at large and "covering their traces." The article asks: "What does Comrade M.L. Demichev, the republic prosecutor, have to say about this?"

BRIEFS

TASHKENT FILM FESTIVAL -- The first meeting of the organizational committee of the Seventh International Film Festival for African, Asian and Latin American countries was held in Tashkent today and was chaired by Deputy Chairman of the Turkmen Council of Ministers Abdullayeva. The film festival will be held 24 May through 3 June 1982 in Tashkent. [Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1315 GMT 16 Nov 81 GF]

SOVIET ECONOMIST DISCUSSES WAGE MECHANISMS

PM161113 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 3 Nov 81 p 2

["**Money** Earnings," Article by Prof L. Kunelskiy, doctor of economic sciences, under the rubric "Improving Management Mechanisms"]

[Text] Wages must be earned -- with these words L.I. Brezhnev expressed accurately and concisely the essence of a problem which is not being actively discussed in the press, within the circle of economic executives and, ultimately, simply within families. The public interest is understandable. As working people, we all see money as the the main source of increasing prosperity.

In recent years much has been done to improve all components of wages -- wage rates, bonuses and various additional payments. The 26th party congress set new tasks in this sphere. What is the best way of fulfilling them? There are various opinions here. I am going to set out my thoughts on the issues which are causing controversy.

We earnings experts know, of course, the motivating force of money earnings. But we also know something else: Pay is not an omnipotent means and one must not reduce all incentives to it alone. In working people's eyes increasing weight is being attached to working conditions, social benefits, the prestige of work, its creative character, a plant's reputation and the climate in the collective. Advanced enterprises skillfully utilize these factors in conjunction with material incentives. For example, the Leningradskiy metal works association has long been raising the forming trades' prestige and using a rich range of not only material but also moral incentives -- in consequence, cadre turnover has dropped and losses of worktime have fallen. At Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast's metallurgical equipment, combine harvester and pipe rolling plants, cadre turnover is 50-100 percent lower than average for the sector thanks to an improvement in working and living conditions and other social factors. There are examples of this kind in every region and every sector.

But other instances are well know, too: Enterprises which give little thought to mechanizing heavy physical labor or to production conditions are constantly short of cadres, even despite a relatively high level of wages. Thus those leaders who consider money earnings a panacea are being very shortsighted. With a stubborness worthy of better application, as they say, they demand all possible privileges and advantages in earnings for their enterprise. Let us call things by their proper names: These are attempts to compensate at society's expense for their own failure as leaders. Of course, it would be absurd to demand that a director should not strive to increase his subordinates earnings. But by what method? Let us take associations well-known to the entire country such as Vaz, the Kaluzhskiy turbinnyy zavod and Avtozil. Thanks to constant concern for the workers' working, living and leisure conditions and a tireless search for reserves, production results and, with them, average wages are increasing steadily here. Since the money has been earned, who is against it?

Quite often one hears economic leaders complain that when they ought to be encouraging skilled and zealous workers they cannot -- their hands are tied by countless prohibitive instructions. Such complaints appear in the press, too. I shall not state whether these opinions are entirely groundless. But are the opportunities for associations and enterprises to motivate highly productive labor so meager? I shall cite a few rights, including some provided quite recently. Enterprises are allowed to pay workers extra for combining trades or fulfilling a set amount of work with fewer staff, and the supplement in these cases may be up to 50 percent of the wage rate of basic pay. It is permitted to increase basic pay supplements to designers and technologists by the same percentage for high skill. Workers can be given a considerable once-only payment for revising technically validated norms. The range of sectors and enterprises entitled to increase up to 20 percent supplements for working with intensive labor norms has been expanded. Another innovation has been introduced recently: It is permitted to pay a bonus of up to 70 percent of the value of saved material resources. The list could go on, but I believe that there is no need.

Why, then, is there talk of a lack of rights? It is sometimes the case that leaders are simply not well aware of their rights. But more frequently the matter is different. Supplements to wage rates and basic pay for high skill and supplements for professional skill to those engaged in particularly responsible work or for increasing labor productivity are paid out only by saving on the wages fund established in the requisite way. When work indicators worsen the supplements are canceled. This is correct. Otherwise what would happed? Outstanding master craftsmen would do their work but without results, and wages expenditure would increase more quickly than production of output.

The ones who complain most frequently of obtacles to the provision of incentives are those very leaders who have not managed to create the conditions for utilizing the rights granted to them. On the other hand, there are fewer complaints about restricted rights where matters have been organized well. It is gratifying to note, for example, that last year the well-known Shchekino method of working with fewer people was applied by twice as many enterprises as in 1978.

There are many disputes over the procedure for awarding bonuses. Some people believe that there are too many bonus systems and that it would be worthwhile reducing them to just one, for fulfilling the plan, for instance. Others object that it is not a question of the number of systems but of how justified bonuses and additional payments are. Both groups agree on one thing: Wage leveling and the payment of bonuses and wages for work which has not been done have a harmful influence on production indicators and people's mentality. Can this defect be eliminated? Undoubtedly. The Kama truck plant collective has set us what is truly an example. Autonomous financing within the plant here is organized in such a way that incentives for individual subdivisions and workers are directly linked with their work achievements. The payment of bonuses is comined with material responsibility for the end results of work, primarily productivity growth and output quality.

It is very convenient to introduce interest in end results with the team form of labor organization, which is to become the main form in the present 5-year plan. At the Kaluga turbine plant, the Ural Sergo Ordzhonikidze heavy machine building plant and many other enterprises team organization of labor has increased labor productivity 15-20 percent. Naturally, wages have also risen. In a good team each ruble of wages is really earned -- for all to see.

The Novokramatorskiy machine building plant, the Sumy Frunze machine building plant, many motor vehicle transport enterprises and the construction industry are making use of the team contract and distributing wages (primarly the premium [nadtarifnaya] part) within the team with the aid of a work participation coefficient. I would warmly recommend this experience -- wage leveling is harmful everywhere, including in teams. The qualitative aspect of the matter deserves special attention today. Last year less than half the teams in industry worked under a unified job contract involving payment for the collective end results. The best organizational forms tested in practice have been distilled by the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the AUCCTU into standard regulations on the production team, team leader, team council and council of team leaders and recommendations on the development of the team form of organizing and encouraging the labor of workers at machine building and metal working enterprises. I take this opportunity to advise specialists to study these documents.

So far we have been discussing things which depend on the production collectives themselves. But in the new 5-year plan wages are also being improved through statewide measures. The state is assigning the equivalent of R10 billion a year for these purposes. Four large-scale measures are being implemented. Let us take a look at them.

First, a new increase is being initiated in the minimum monthly wage -- to R80 -- and in wage and salary rates. Workers and employees in the coal industry and the shale industry and mining construction will be the first to transfer to the new renumeration in 1982-1983. Wage rates will increase by an average of 27 percent for underground work, by 23-24 percent in opencut mining work and 18-20 percent in other work.

Second, part of the funds will go into the regionalization of wages. Taking into account previous measures, all workers and employees in eastern and northern regions, including the Urals, a number of regions of Kazakhstan and the north of Vologodskaya and Kirovskaya Oblasts, will have earnings advantages through the use of regional coefficients.

Third, allowances for continuous service are being introduced in the south of the Far East and East Siberia Regions. In other words, work of many years' standing will be encouraged not only in a given region but also at a single enterprise.

Sometimes people suggest introducing awards everywhere for long service and even making all wages dependent on length of service. This is scarcely rational. In some very important sectors, particularly those with hard working conditions and for leading categories of workers, such awards do exist. But in general, length of service still does not determine the results of labor. In addition, if this remuneration were to exist everywhere, leading sectors would forfeit their present advantages.

Fourth, additional remuneration for night work is continuing to be increased in some sectors. The point of this measure is clear: to encourage the growth of the shift index. A number of benefits and privileges for workers employed on a shift schedule should also be introduced by the enterprises themselves using their own funds.

As we can see, the effectiveness of labor remuneration is a subtle matter. Large-scale socioeconomic problems must be resolved and many factors must be considered to ensure that every ruble is really earned.

MINISTRIES WITH UNDERUTILIZED RESERVES NAMED

LD192030 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Commentary by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA Deputy Chief Editor Vasiliy Pavlovich Polenov]

[Text] Colossal labor resources have been created in our country. The value of fixed productive assets alone has reached R1 trillion. However, the return on these assets is unfortunately falling. The 26th party congress promised to implement measures aimed at raising returns on assets in branches of the national economy and in associations and enterprises. The beginning of the 5-year plan was marked by one major shortfall: During 1976-80 increases in the output of most goods were lower than the growth of capacities for their production.

The USSR Central Statistical Administration examined the utilization of industrial capacities brought into operation or renovated in the period 1976-80. In the coal industry, for instance, about half the new projects were brought into operation behind schedule. New projects belonging to the Ministry of the Chemical Industry underproduced to the tune of over 80,000 tons of synthetic resins and plastics, 27,000 tons of synthetic detergents, and much other production.

Returns on assets, on both new and established production capacities, depend to a decisive extent on the number of shifts in which equipment is employed. If 8 years ago the shift utilization coefficient at Leningrad engineering enterprises stood at 1.18 it now stands 11 percent higher. There are many expensive categories of equipment, automatic lines, unique machines and foundry equipment operating two full shifts. The manpower for this is not obtained from spare reserves, it has been released from operating capacities through the consistent mechanization of manual labor.

A second important reserve lies in the technical retooling of operating capcities. Two years ago our newspaper criticized leaders of the Mintekhkhimprom for the poor utilization of technology imported into the industry. The minister, Comrade (Fedorov), then reported that measures had been taken to resolve the situation.

However, over the last year in the industry, stocks of imported equipment which has not been installed have increased 1.5 times. There are growing stocks of uninstalled equipment, both imported and of domestic manufacture, at enterprises belonging to the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, Ministry of Power and Electrification and Ministry of the Food Industry. Fixed productive assets are a principal material resource. The level of our economy depends directly on how fully and skilfully this colossal arsenal for creativity is used.

BRIEFS

ARMENIAN ECONOMY PLAN -- The Armenian SSR excelled in the 10-month economic plan for 1981. Revenues of R120 million, over the expected amount, were achieved through various industrial and agricultural products. During the last 10 months, 11.5 billion kw of power has been produced and 210 new machines invented. Moreover, Armenian laborers were awarded new accomodations that total 0.5 million square meters. [Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 18 Nov 81 GF]

ARMENIAN SUBWAY CONSTRUCTION -- Yerevan's subway construction plans are progressing on a large scale. The new subway from (Sasuntsi David) station to Ogdemberyan Square, which will have a length of 4.3 km and include three stations, is expected to be completed by 1985. The total length of the subways in Yerevan by 1990 is expected to be 46 km. The allocation for new subway projects in Yerevan for the next 5 years is R70 million, out of which R57.5 million will be alloted for the (Sasuntsi David) and Ogdemberyan subways. [Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 16 Nov 81 GF]

ARMENIAN HEALTH RESORT -- The Armenian Dzhermug health town is well known for its natural beauty and its mineral water springs. Dzhermug mineral water is exported to all the Soviet republics as well as overseas. Some R4 million is spent every year for repair and new construction in Dzhermug. [Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 16 Nov 81 GF]

TURKMEN GAS PRODUCTION -- Turkmen gas production workers have pledged to produce 81-83 billion cubic meters of gas during the current 11th 5-Year Plan. [Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 17 Nov 81 GF]

TURKMEN OIL EXTRACTION COMPLEX -- Large oil extraction complex is under construction in the Turkmen SSR. When finished, the complex is expected to produce more than 2 million tons of oil per annum. [Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 18 Nov 81 GF]

USSR-INDIAN 'BHASKARA-2' SATELLITE LAUNCHED

LD201406 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 20 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov TASS -- The Indian satellite Bhaskara-2 was launched into space by a Soviet carrier rocket in the USSR today under the Soviet-Indian program of cooperation in the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space.

The satellite is designed to study the earth's natural resources with television and microwave radiometers developed and produced by Indian specialists.

The satellite was inserted into orbit with the following parameters:

-- Maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee) -- 557 kilometers.
-- Minimum distance from the earth's surface (perigee) -- 514 km.
-- Initial period of revolution -- 95.2 minutes.
-- Orbit inclination -- 50.7 degrees.

The satellite was developed with the Soviet Union's scientific and technological assistance. Indian specialists took part in preparing the satellite for the blast-off.

The satellite's onboard equipment is functioning normally.

Data sent by the Bhaskara-2 satellite is being received by ground stations in the Soviet Union and India.

ACADEMICIAN ADVOCATES SCIENCE, PRODUCTION TIES

PM181109 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 12 November publishes on page 3 an 1,800-word article by Academician B. Paton, director of the Ye.O. Paton Institute of Electric Welding, president of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and twice hero of socialist labor, under the heading "From Introduction to Cooperation."

Paton argues the need for "the expansion of close businesslike daily cooperation between scientific research organizations and industrial enterprises on the basis of the principles of socialist competition and their joint solution of the problems of scientific and technical progress" in order to accelerate the introduction of scientific achievements into production and discusses the institute's own experience in this field. Pointing out that today's complex technical problems can no longer be resolved by a simple "plant-institute" partnership but require "the efforts of numerous organizations and enterprises of different ministries and departments." Paton goes on to suggest that the reluctance of some enterprises to undertake the long and agonizing process of assimilating technical innovations may be overcome by creating a "good experimental production base" and that "in creating new enterprises and modernizing existing ones it is essential to envisage some reserve of capacities, albeit a small one, making it possible without detriment to the plan to assimilate new equipment and technology and modernize production promptly, constantly maintaining it at a modern level."

Finally, Paton discusses the role which can be played here by socialist competition and material and other incentives, noting that "monetary awards have to a considerable extent, exhausted themselves" and suggesting that other incentives such as "the out-of-turn provision of housing for the most active participants in the struggle for technical progress" be used as well. Socialist competition "for the successful solution of the most important scientific and technical problems" has been gaining strength recently, he adds, citing examples of his institute's initiatives in this direction.

SOVIET ROCKET TROOPS, ARTILLERY DAY CELEBRATED

Moscow Meeting Held

LD200030 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2052 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov (TASS) -- Successfully solving the tasks of communist construction the Soviet state is firmly and consistently pursuing a peace-loving foreign policy and together with the fraternal countries of the socialist community is waging a persistent struggle for peace and the security of the peoples.

This was stressed today by Vladimir Tolubko, commander in chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces and USSR deputy minister of defense. He was speaking at a meeting of representatives of the working people of Moscow devoted to Rocket Troops and Artillery day, which is being marked today.

Vladimir Tolubko noted that recently, as a result of the aggressive intrigues of imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, the international situation has worsened and that there has been an increase in the military danger. The ruling circles of the United States and the other NATO countries are attempting at all costs to achieve military and strategic superiority over the USSR and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. The United States has mounted an arms race which is unprecedented in scale.

The Chinese leaders are teaming up with the most aggressive forces of imperialism, the speaker stressed. The partnership between imperialism and Beijing hegemonism presents a serious danger for the whole of mankind.

In these circumstances, Tolubko stated, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are doing everything necessary to ensure the reliable security of the Soviet homeland and of all the countries of the socialist community.

Tolubko Television Speech

OW200739 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0921 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Army Gen Vladimir Fedorovich Tolubko, USSR deputy minister of defense, commander in chief of strategic rocket forces and hero of socialist labor, speaking on the occasion of Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day]

[Text] Dear comrades, today our country is marking Strategic Rocket Forces and Artillery Day, one of the remarkable holidays of labor glory. On this memorable day, we duly pay deep respects to the heroic feats of frontline troops, mark the military merits of the present generation of rocket and artillery troops and pay due respects to our scientists, designers, engineers, technologists and workers in the defense industry -- the creators of first class rocket and artillery arms.

This year, the traditional holiday of rocket and artillery troops is being marked in a portentous atmosphere. Our country's working people and troops of the armed forces are implementing, with enormous enthusiam, the historic decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. This year, the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the Great Patriotic War is being observed, as well as one of its major battles -- the historic Battle of Moscow. We can see particularly clearly from the example of the Battle of Moscow the great contribution which our cannon and rocket artillery made to the common cause of defeating the fascist aggressors.

A particularly memorable day was 19 November 1942, when the salvoes of thousands of our guns, mortars and rocket installations told the whole world about the beginning of the fascists' defeat at Stalingrad. Soviet artillery swept away the enemies fortifications, destroyed his manpower and material, and cleared the way to victory for the tanks and infantry. A 330,000 strong grouping of fascists -- a select strike force of the Hitlerite army -- was surrounded and destroyed at the walls of the Volga stronghold. A fundamental turning point of the whole war took place.

In memory of the historic battle on the Volga and to commemorate the outstanding merits of Soviet artillery and the heroic feats of artillery troops this day, 19 November, has since 1944 become Artillery Day, a nationwide holiday. In connection with the establishment of the strategic rocket forces, since 1964 this day has been observed as Rocket Forces and Artillery day.

Permit me to cordially congratulate our glorious frontline troops, troops of the armed forces and all Soviet people on the occasion of this universal holiday and to wish them good health, happiness and new successes in service and labor for the benefit of our great motherland.

The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community are firmly following the course of peace and construction. They are waging an active and persistent struggle to implement the peace progrom proposed by the 26th CPSU Congress and to preserve and strengthen detente. In his speech at the reception in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, on the occasion of the 64th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev once again most forcefully reiterated: The Soviet Union will do everything to justify the hopes of peoples and will firmly and invariably defend the cause of peace, justice and freedom.

However, the ruling circles of the United States and their allies in the aggressive NATO bloc have sharply changed their foreign policy course. Through their fault, tensions in the international situation have sharply increased and the military danger has grown. The United States has initiated an arms race unprecendented in scale. The Reagan administration is planning to spend 1.5 trillion dollars within the next 5 years for this purpose. A lion's share of this astronomical sum is predicated for the modernization and build-up of first strike strategic nuclear forces, such as the MX missile, the Trident submarine system, new strategic bombers and cruise missiles. In the next decade, the United States plans to build more than 13,000 of these missiles alone.

Under Washington's pressure, the NATO leadership has decided to deploy qualitatively new American medium-range missile systems and cruise missiles in Western Europe, in addition to the extant means of attack. The U.S. administration's decision to begin full-scale production of neutron weapons -- the most barbarous means of human mass destruction -- is a challenge to all mankind.

Acting within the bloc of reactionary forces of imperialism are the Chinese leaders.

Under these conditions the CPSU and Soviet Government are doing everything possible to frustrate the aggressive plans of U.S. imperialist reactionaries and their NATO allies. Owing to the paternal concern of the party and Soviet state and of all our people, the armed forces and their component part -- the strategic rocket forces -- are completely equipped to insure the reliable defense of the motherland and of all countries of the socialist community. They possess a mighty combat potential and a durable fusion of highly technical equipment, martial skills and invincible morale.

The "Zapad-81" exercises of troops and naval forces, held in September, were a combat test for Soviet troops in fulfilling the demands of the 26th CPSU Congress and their constitutional duty to their motherland.

In his report at the solemn meeting in honor of the 64th anniversary of Great October, Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, declared: The party has always proceeded and still proceeds from the Leninist principle of the inseparability of a consistent struggle for peace and constant readiness to rebuff any aggressor. While there are those in the world who love to play with fire, we will not retreat even one step from this principle.

Rocket and artillery troops are making a worthy contribution to insuring the security of the motherland and the conquests of socialism. Rocket troops are troops that are always at combat readiness day and night, in winter and summer. In any weather they are, in a word, always -- while the situation demands this -- vigilantly standing on combat duty. Today, on the day of their holiday, rocketmen and artillery troops are reporting to their native Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee that they have successfully completed the academic year and have achieved new and higher frontiers in combat perfection and in strengthening military discipline.

The ranks of excellent troops, class specialists and masters of military affairs among the troops have increased. The number of excellent subunits and units has increased. Ideologically tempered, comprehensively trained officer cadres stand at the head of rocket and artillery subunits and units. They are people of high culture and strong will who profoundly know and love their job. Among the rocket forces more than 75 percent of the officers have engineering training, more than 90 percent are class specialists and genuine masters of the rocket business and nearly all of them are communists or Komsomol members.

Highly skilled specialists have become the main figures in the Soviet officer corps. The availability of these officer cadres serves as a guarantee for further successes in the military tasks of rocketmen and artillery troops.

According to this year's results, excellent achievements in combat and political training have been recorded by the personnel of the unit under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Shelestov, initiator of socialist competition among rocket troops. This remarkable military collective completely fulfilled the set tasks and adopted pledges. More than 70 percent of the troops have become specialists of a higher class, and every third officer is a master of military affairs. Sixty percent of the subunits in the unit and 55 percent of the combat teams are excellent. All the troops possess contiguous skills, and for the sixth consecutive year the unit has won the title of excellence.

Foremost rocket and artillery units and subunits under the command of Comrades Regentov, Belousov, Kosyanov, Chusov, Zlobin, Mikhalov, Belyakov, Olennik, Shcheglov, Kravchenko, Kovalev, Grigoryev, Kuzin and many others enjoy a good reputation. Concrete and purposeful party political work contributed considerably to the achievement of high indexes in military training and fulfillment of adopted socialist pledges.

The current generation of rocket and artillery troops is continuing the combat traditions of the frontline troops with honor and dignity. Alongside the orders awarded for feats in the Great Patriotic War, awards for high skills and mastery of complex military equipment in peacetime glitter on the combat banners of many units. Many rocket and artillery troops have been honored in the year of the 26th CPSU Congress with high state awards for high achievements in combat and political training.

A new upsurge in the people's political and labor activity was evoked with the celebration of the 64th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the decisions of the November 1981 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the 6th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the vivid and interesting speech made at the plenum by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Soviet people are selflessly struggling for successful fulfillment of the 1981 plan and are doing everything to raise even further the economic and defensive might of our motherland.

Fulfilling the decisions of the 26th party congress, the commanders, political organs and party organizations of the rocket forces are directing their main efforts toward further improving the quality and efficiency of teaching and training of troops and to forming in them an active position in life and a conscientious attitude to fulfillment of their military duty. Loyal to their people and closely united around their native Communist Party and its militant staff -- the Leninist Central Committee -- the rocketmen and artillery troops are always on the alert and are ready at any moment to fulfill their patriotic duty together with all the troops of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Greetings on the holiday, dear comrades.

General Gorchakov Address

LD191256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0910 GMT 19 Nov 81

[Col Gen Petr Andreyevich Gorchakov, member of the Military Council and head of the Political Directorate of the strategic rocket forces, speaks on the occasion of Rocket Troops and Artillery Day -- recorded; date, place not given]

[Excerpts] We have to solve the question of building communism in conditions of a complex military-political situation. Bellicose circles of the United States and NATO, under the cover of false concoctions about a Soviet military threat, have unleashed feverish militarist activity. The flywheel of the arms race has been unwound at full speed. Japan and China are being drawn more and more into the orbit of military preparations, and if the Soviet Union is strengthening its defense capability and maintaining its armed forces in a state of constant combat readiness, then it is compelled to do so in the face of an unconcealed military threat on the part of the aggressive circles of imperialism, stressed Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, USSR minister of defense and marshal of the Soviet Union, at the festive meeting devoted to the 64th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

In these conditions, rocket and artillery troops, like all servicemen of the army and navy, profoundly understand the immense historic responsibility of the Soviet Armed Forces for the fate of peace on earth. They stand vigilantly and reliably on guard over the peaceful, creative labor of the Soviet people and the great gains of socialism. They are inspired by feats of arms and glorious fighting traditions and heroic exploits of earlier generations. This year the celebration of the Rocket Troops and Artillery Day has coincided with the 40th anniversary of one of the major battles of the last war, the Battle for Moscow.

The Soviet people can be assured that its armed forces are a reliable shield for our fatherland. The rocket and artillery troops are making a worthy contribution to solving the task of defending the country and raising the combat potential of the army and navy. They possess the most up-to-date fighting equipment. The strategic rocket troops are equipped with improved missile sites, communications and tactical control systems. Fighting detachments of rocket troops fulfill day and night tasks of state importance and vigilantly carry out their combat duty. The ground forces, air defense forces, the air force and navy now have missiles and the latest artillery systems. This has considerably enhanced their fighting capabilities. The rocket and artillery troops are constantly improving their combat skill and persistently enhancing their combat readiness, guaranteeing an immediate rebuff to any aggressor. They are utterly devoted to the cause of communism, are toughened ideologically, and possess high qualities of fighting efficiency and political morale. The "Zapad-81" exercises were an (?ideal) school and tough examination on fighting maturity for many artillery troops.

Closely knit around the Communist Party, the rocket and artillery troops, like all servicemen of the army and navy, are fulfilling with honor their patriotic and international duty in reliably defending the sacred borders of our Soviet homeland and the great gains of socialism. They are fully determined to implement the historic plans of the party's 26th congress, the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee November plenum and the 6th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Dear comrades! I heartily congratulate rocket troops and artillery troops, veterans of the armed forces and employees in the defense industry on their holiday of labor glory, Rocket Troops and Artillery Day. I wish you good health, happiness and further successes in your work for the glory of your beloved homeland.

SHCHERBITSKIY ADDRESSES KIEV MILITARY COUNCIL

PM191245 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 81 p 1

[Correspondent Col Engr B. Lyapkalo report: "Improving the Effectiveness of Combat Training"]

[Text] Red Banner Kiev Military District -- A Military Council session has examined the results of combat and political training and competition in the last training year.

The reports delivered by Army Gen I.A. Gerasimov, district commander, and Col Gen V.T. Dementyev, member of the Military Council and chief of the district Political Directorarte, and the speeches delivered by those taking part in the session noted that the formations and units mainly fulfilled their combat and political training plans and socialist pledges. However, full use is still not being made everywhere of the potential for improving the effectiveness of combat training and strengthening military discipline. The reasons for the shortcomings were revealed and recommendations were given for their elimination.

The Military Council session was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee.

STRATEGIC ROCKET FORCES DEPUTY COMMANDER DIES

PM191549 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 81 p 3

[Unattributed obituary of Col Gen M.G. Grigoryev]

[Excerpts] Col Gen Mikhail Grigoryevich Grigoryev, an eminent Soviet military leader, active participant in the Great Patriotic War, Lenin Prize winner and USSR Supreme Soviet deputy has died after a short and serious illness.

M.G. Grigoryev was born 23 October 1917 in the village of Molodka, Bezhetskiy Rayon, Kalininskaya Oblast, in the family of a poor peasant.

[Signed] D.F. Ustinov, N.V. Ogarkov, V.G. Kulikov, A.A. Yepishev, S.L. Sokolov, V.F. Tolubko, N.I. Savinkin, V.I. Petrov, A.I. Kolounov, P.S. Kutakhov, S.G. Gorshkov, K.S. Moskalenko, S.K. Kurotkin, A.T. Altunin, V.M. Shabanov, N.F. Shestopalov, I.N. Shkadov, I.Kh. Bagramyan, A.I. Sorokin, M.G. Sobolev, A.D. Melekhin, V.N. Dutov, G.N. Malinovskiy, Yu. A. Pichugin, Ye.V. Boychuk, P.P. Svotin, A.A. Maksimov, V.N. Mitropov, F.P. Tonkikh, K.M. Vorobeyev, V.P. Lukin, M.A. Nikolskiy, P.A. Degtyarev

MAJOR GENERAL VISHENSKIY'S OBITUARY PUBLISHED

PM180911 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 81 p 4

[Obituary of N.I. Vishenskiy]

[Excerpts] Maj Gen Avn Nikolay Ivanovich Vishenskiy has died suddenly while performing his duties, having devoted all his conscious life to service of the socialist motherland and the Communist Party, which he joined in 1944.

N.I. Vishenskiy was born in 1922, in a peasant family.

[Signed] S.G. Gorshkov, A.I. Sorokin, P.N. Medvedev, N.I. Smirnov, G.M. Yegorov, V.G. Novikov, P.G. Kotov, G.A. Bondarenko, L.V. Mizin, A.A. Mironenko, P.N. Navoytsev, V.Kh. Saakyan, I.M. Tropynin, G.A. Kuznetsov, A.M. Tomashevskiy, V.I. Voronov, A.I. Pavlovskiy, V.P. Potapov, Yu. S. Gudkov

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM ANNOUNCES PROMOTIONS

LD022050 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 81

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to confer the military title of army general on Col Gen Petr Georgiyevich Lushev, Col Gen Mikhail Ivanovich Sorokin and Col Gen Engr Vitaliy Mikhaylovich Shabanov, and the title of marshal of aviation on Col Gen Avn Nikolay Mikhaylovich Skomorokhov.